DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 252 914 EA 017 327

AUTHOR Roberts, Jane M. E.; Newcombe, Ellen I.
TITLE Supervision: Practice and Preference in the State of Maryland.
INSTITUTION Research for Better Schools, Inc., Philadelphia, Pa.
SPONS AGENCY Maryland State Dept. of Education, Baltimore.; National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Sep 84
NOTE 95p.; Appendixes and some tables may reproduce poorly due to small print.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Administration; Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation; *Instructional Improvement; Organizational Development; Questionnaires; School Districts; Superintendents; Surveys; *Teacher Supervision
IDENTIFIERS *Maryland

ABSTRACT

Results of a study of practices and preferences in teacher supervision and evaluation in Maryland public schools are reported. The study surveyed supervisory practices in 24 local education agencies (LEA's) through a survey questionnaire and a literature search. The report identifies 18 key findings and issues relating to supervision, including the following: (1) The larger the district, the more teachers are supervised by any one supervisor. (2) More attention is paid to the "means" of data collection than to the "end" of instructional improvement. (3) In practice, assistant supervisors, central office supervisors, and school-based supervisors rarely have a common understanding of the purpose, philosophy, and process of supervision. (4) Supervisors prefer to be independent and want to develop greater expertise in using relevant research. The study also found a wide range of perspectives, expertise, and approaches in locally developed materials for supervision and evaluation. While diversity may be appropriate, the researchers felt there should be cohesion with an LEA and stronger evidence of activity to improve instructional practice. LEA's may benefit from applying a process of interactive strategic planning, improving coordination, reducing organizational complexity, and focusing on improvement of supervision. Included are 20 tables and a 4-page bibliography. Ten appendixes provide summaries of models of supervision study. (MD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

EA 017 377

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
PURPOSE AND METHODS OF THE STUDY	2
ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT OF SUPERVISION	7
Who are the Supervisors?	7
Number of Teachers Supervised	12
Number of Schools Visited	16
Number of People Supervising a Teacher	16
Common Understanding of Supervision	19
Organizational Arrangements	24
ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF SUPERVISORS	35
Supervisory Responsibilities	35
Job Descriptions	35
Supervisors' Perceptions of Responsibilities	36
Responsibilities and Accountabilities	39
The Use of Supervisory Time	42
Observation and Assistance	51
Focus on Instructional Process	52
Focus on Instructional Content	62
Supervisor-Teacher Interactions	64
Improving Assistance	67
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	70
BIBLIOGRAPHY	73
APPENDICES	77

LIST OF TABLES

1. Survey Respondents by Role Group and District Size

2. Participation in Supervision and Evaluation of Elementary Teachers by Percent of LEAs

3. Participation in Supervision and Evaluation of Secondary Teachers by Percent of LEAs

4. Average Number of Teachers Supervised at Elementary and Secondary Levels by Central Office Supervisors, by District Size

5. Average Number of Teachers Supervised at Elementary and Secondary Levels by School-Based Staff, by District Size

6. Average Number of Schools Visited by Central Office and School-Based Supervisors

7. Average Number of People Supervising/Evaluating a Teacher

8. Perceptions about Common Purpose, Philosophy, and Process of Supervision

9. Practice and Preference of the Nature of Supervision

10. Alternative Models of Organizing for Supervision

11. Summary of Advantages and Disadvantages Regarding Seven Common Bureaucratic Models for Supervision of Instruction

12. Examples of Organizational Models in Maryland

13. Ratings of General Understanding of Activity Relating to Direct Supervision

14. Practice and Preference of Central Office Supervisor's Use of Time

15. Assistant Superintendents' Estimates of Central Office Supervisors' Use of Time

16. Practice and Preference of School-Based Supervisors' Use of Time

17. Supervisory Practice and Preference in Looking at How a Teacher Teaches in Large, Medium, and Small LEAs

18. Ratings of Supervisory Practice and Preference of Looking at What a Teacher Teaches in Large, Medium, and Small LEAs

19. Ratings of Practice and Preference of Supervisor-Teacher Interactions

20. A Comparison of Two Purposes for Teacher Observation/Evaluation

INTRODUCTION

Over the past 10 years, attention to school improvement has moved from a student focus (competency-based education), to a focus on classrooms (teacher effectiveness), and to schools (the role of principals, and school effectiveness factors). Maryland has attended to these interests through Project Basic, SITIP (School Improvement Through Instructional Process), the Professional Development Academy, and activities of the Commission on Quality Teaching and of the Task Force on Secondary Schools. The overall trend has been to move outward from a single student, teacher, or administrator, toward organizational units -- classroom, school, and district. Attention has been given to processes related to success, including communication and coordination, and to the interdependent responsibilities of various educational role groups.

The trend has continued, and the focus has moved to the central office (the role of supervisors, and organizational effectiveness factors). Accordingly, senior administrators of the Maryland State Department of Education and of the 24 local education agencies (LEAs) have begun to explore one area of central office responsibility: supervision.

This report was developed to help Maryland educators look at their own practices and preferences in relation to the relevant professional literature. It outlines the methods used to collect and synthesize information, discusses organization and management, reviews observation and assessment, and presents conclusions and recommendations. Summaries of models are included in a set of appendices. The report is intended to help Maryland assistant superintendents and superintendents plan for improvement of supervision by establishing a common knowledge base among them.

PURPOSE AND METHODS OF THE STUDY

This study explores practice and preference in teacher supervision and evaluation, using data from administrative and supervisory staff in the 24 local education agencies (LEAs) of the state of Maryland, and relates results to discussions in the literature. It addresses the following questions.

- What staff assignments, organizational arrangements, and time allocations are used for supervision and evaluation?
- What guidelines, procedures, or observation/evaluation systems are used by supervisors?
- What do supervisors do and what do they prefer in carrying out their supervisory responsibilities?

The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) provided the initiative for the study in response to interest expressed by LEA assistant superintendents. In the spring of 1984, staff of Research for Better Schools (RBS) met with that group, and it was decided to use a survey questionnaire to investigate current practices and preferred methods of supervision, as well as organizational arrangements for supervision. Assistant superintendents specified that the data gathered through the survey should be applicable to an improvement effort, and they determined the general scope and administration procedures for the survey. Before drafting the questionnaire, RBS staff consulted with a national expert on supervision about its proposed design. Finally, a committee of assistant superintendents reviewed the completed instrument and recommended some revisions which were made by RBS.

It should be noted that Maryland has a county/district structure. That is, each local education agency (LEA) is a county (or, in the case of Baltimore, a city). Across the state there are 24 LEAs with 1,183 schools (798 elementary, and 385 secondary) serving approximately 670,000 students.

Districts range in size from those serving eight schools, to those serving as many as 164 schools. For the purposes of this study, data were analyzed by district size, with "small" districts having between eight and 18 schools, "medium" districts having between 24 and 46 schools, and "large" districts having between 104 and 164 schools. (In comparing Maryland's supervisory practicies with those described in the literature or practiced elsewhere, one needs to keep in mind organizational size and complexity, especially since some theoretical models of supervision were developed for small systems.)

The questionnaires were sent to all of the 24 Maryland LEAs in June of 1984. In each local district invited respondents included: the assistant superintendent of instruction, two central office supervisors, two school principals (elementary and secondary), and (if appropriate) two "helping teachers" or other building level supervisors (e.g., curriculum coordinator, vice principal). Local respondents were selected as typical members of the role group by assistant superintendents. Out of a total of 168 questionnaires distributed, 88 were returned in time for data analysis.* Questionnaires were returned directly to RBS. Table 1 shows the number of returns from each role group and by size of school district (large, medium, or small).** Seventeen of the 24 assistant superintendents returned surveys. All counties were represented in the survey sample to some extent.

---

* An additional six surveys were returned after the deadline. Answers to the open ended questions were analyzed and included in results as appropriate.

** District size: large (i.e., Baltimore City, Baltimore, Prince George's, Montgomery, Anne Arundel); medium (i.e., Allegany, Harford, Howard, Frederick, St. Mary's, Washington, Cecil, Carroll, Charles, Wicomico); small (i.e., Kent, Caroline, Talbot, Queen Anne's, Calvert, Dorchester, Garrett, Somerset, Worcester).

Table 1

Survey Respondents By Role Group and District Size*

District Size	Role Group								
		Central Office Supervisors			Principals				
	Assistant Superintendents	Elementary	Secondary	Secondary Elementary	Elementary	Secondary	Building Level Supervisors	Helping Teacher	Total
Large	2	3	2	1	4	4	0	4	20
Medium	7	6	6	1	6	4	2	2	34
Small	8	0	10	3	4	5	3	0	34
Total	17	9	18	5	14	14	5	6	88

* Surveys were distributed as follows: 24 to assistant superintendents; 48 to central office supervisors; 48 to principals. Forty-eight surveys were provided for other supervisory staff, but were distributed by assistant superintendents only in those LEAs in which other role groups have significant supervisory responsibilities.

The questionnaire, consisting of four parts, asked respondents to: (1) provide general background information (role, district size, and supervisory responsibilities), (2) indicate practice and preference for supervisory tasks (process and content of supervision, interaction with teachers, supervisory roles and philosophy), (3) estimate use of supervisory time, and (4) describe operating constraints, influences, and accountabilities. Respondents also forwarded to RBS copies of job descriptions and organizational charts, and materials related to supervision such as evaluation forms, observation procedures, and guidelines or statements of philosophy. While those having supervisory responsibilities (central office staff, principals and other school-based administrators, and teachers in various roles) reported their own opinions or nature and scope of tasks, assistant superintendents (as the instructional leaders of the LEAs) on some items reported their perceptions of what supervisors did.* These perceptions reflected formal assignments made. Congruence of perceptions and statements of supervisors was theoretically desirable. When it did not occur, it signalled a need for organizational communication.

Standard statistical procedures were used to analyze results by item for each area addressed. Although results were broken down both by role group and by district size, unless great differences were found for a role group or size of district, only total mean scores for items are reported here. Data are reported as a specific number, as a mean (average), or as a percentage.

---

* General reference to supervisory tasks or supervisors relates to all role groups undertaking these responsibilities. The term "central office supervisor" is used when specific reference is made to that role group. All respondents other than assistant superintendents and central office staff are considered school-based staff.

In addition to employing standard statistical procedures on appropriate items, the open-ended questions on the questionnaire and the supplementary materials submitted were analyzed. Finally, a systematic literature search was conducted including computerized ERIC searches, retrieval from bibliographies, documents recommended by experts in the field, and works frequently cited. Over 100 documents were examined and relevant information from them synthesized. Results from the LEAs are reported in relationship to conclusions of the literature.

ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT OF SUPERVISION

Each school system operates on certain assumptions of organizational effectiveness. Those assumptions, plus the traditions and values of the LEA, influence resource allocation and determine organizational arrangements, establishing structures that influence all aspects of supervision. This chapter reviews organizational parameters of current supervisory practice in Maryland by discussing: (1) who the people are that assume supervisory roles, (2) the number of teachers supervised by an individual, (3) the number of schools a supervisor has to travel to in order to carry out his/her responsibilities, (4) the number of persons who supervise/evaluate each teacher, (5) common understandings of supervision, and (6) the most common organizational arrangements for supervision.

Who are the Supervisors?*

Persons supervising/evaluating teachers include: (1) non-administrative staff in a single school who teach part time, such as department heads or teacher coordinators; (2) others who consider themselves school-based, are not referred to as administrators, usually do not teach on a regular basis, and may work in one school or several, such as curriculum coordinators or resource teachers; (3) vice principals and principals; (4) central office specialists and supervisors.** In general, elementary supervisors are generalists and secondary supervisors are subject-area specialists.

---

* For the purposes of this paper, the term "supervisor" is used in referring to anyone with supervisory responsibilities. The term "central office supervisor" is used to refer to district level staff.

** In at least one LEA, position titles do not adequately convey supervisory responsibilities. For instance, a vice principal (by title) may be a supervisor (by certification), and may carry out both roles. Or a teacher (by title) may function as a supervisor working across several schools.

Formal certification requirements and levels of authority vary among each of these role groups, and different kinds of expertise are apparent. Also, classification varies, with principals, vice principals, and central office staff considered to be administrative and supervisory (A&S), and the other two role groups usually considered to be teachers. This distinction is important not only in how each is perceived by classroom teachers, but also in how they are collectively perceived by the lay community when the organizational and staffing arrangements of a school system are examined; the fewer A&S staff listed, the easier it is to refute accusations of a top-heavy administration.

When role group labels are set aside, each person assuming some supervisory responsibility theoretically has expertise to offer. When based in a single school, application of that expertise is facilitated by proximity and frequency of contact, and such accessibility is usually recognized as supportive (Roberts & Kenney, 1984). When working across schools the supervisor draws on a wider base of experience for enrichment and helping teachers network. Across-school supervisors can facilitate articulation between schools (e.g., junior to senior high school), and application of the standardized core curriculum that exists in most Maryland LEAs. Within-school supervisors can facilitate cross-grade articulation of the curriculum, attending to pre-requisite skills of students. Generalists tend to focus on instructional processes and student activity; specialists tend to focus on curriculum content and teacher presentation. The former are found most often supervising elementary teachers, the latter at the secondary level.

At the elementary level, according to assistant superintendents of 16 LEAs, primary responsibility for teacher evaluation usually belongs to the

principal. Primary responsibility for supervision and assistance belongs to the principals in 56% of the LEAs, and to central office supervisors in 63% of the LEAs. In a few cases, primary responsibility for both evaluation and supervision is undertaken by vice principals and others. (See Table 2.)

At the secondary level, principals are primarily responsible for teacher evaluation in 75% of the LEAs, with primary responsibility undertaken by central office staff in 38% of the districts, and by vice-principals in 19% of the districts. Supervision and assistance is the primary responsibility of central office staff in 56% of the LEAs and of principals in 38% of the LEAs. (See Table 3.)

These data indicate that there may be confusion in several districts. Ultimately only one person can assume primary responsibility for a given task, with others involved to various degrees, but if two or more role groups assume primary responsibility, there must be powerful coordinating mechanisms in place to avoid confusion. Survey data indicate that such coordination is rare. While there is some evidence that central office supervisors may review teacher progress with principals in a systematic manner, it is more common for each role group to work fairly separately. Such separation is more likely at the secondary level, where emphasis is given to subject area expertise.

The more role groups involved, the greater is the potential confusion, especially if more than one group assumes primary responsibility. From a teacher's perspective, it is desirable that the two or three supervisors involved give matching messages. From a central office supervisor's perspective, it is desirable that the effort invested is worthwhile, since visiting seven or eight schools to work with an average of 94 teachers with a mean expenditure of 63 days during the year is fairly demanding and should not be

Table 2

Participation in Supervision and Evaluation of Elementary Teachers by Percent of LEAs
(as Reported by 16 Assistant Superintendents)

Type of Participation in Supervision	Central Office Staff		Principals		Vice Principals		School-Based Others*	
	P**	I**	P	I	P	I	P	I
Supervision/ Assistance	63%	25%	56%	0%	6%	19%	6%	25%
Evaluation	25%	19%	88%	0%	6%	13%	0%	69%
General Participation***	6%	25%	13%	0%	0%	13%	0%	6%

* School-Based Others include curriculum coordinators and resource teachers.

** P = primary responsibility; I = involvement, but not a primary responsibility.

*** Included in this category are those responses which failed to distinguish between participation as supervision/assistance and/or as evaluation.

Table 3

Participation in Supervision and Evaluation of Secondary Teachers by Percent of LEAs
(as reported by Assistant Superintendents, N=16)
(as Reported by 16 Assistant Superintendents)

Type of Participation in Supervision	Central Office Staff		Principals		Vice Principals		School-Based Others*	
	P**	I**	P	I	P	I	P	I
Supervision/ Assistance	56%	31%	38%	6%	6%	25%	6%	19%
Evaluation	38%	19%	75%	6%	19%	19%	0%	0%
General Participation***	13%	19%	13%	0%	0%	19%	0%	0%

* School-Based Others include curriculum coordinators and resource teachers.

** P = primary responsibility; I = involvement, but not a primary responsibility.

*** Included in this category are those responses which failed to distinguish between participation as supervision/assistance and/or as evaluation.

at cross purposes nor redundant in light of other supervisors' activities. These concerns relate to the extent to which incumbents of the supervisory role have a common understanding of the purpose and tasks of supervision.

Number of Teachers Supervised

One important feature of a supervisory structure is the number of teachers supervised by each supervisor. Table 4 shows the average number of teachers supervised by central office supervisors, who each stated the number of teachers they supervised. Assistant superintendents stated their perceptions of the number of teachers supervised by central office supervisors.

Results indicate that assistant superintendents believe that the average number of teachers supervised at the elementary level is 83.93, but central office staff report that they supervise an average of 119.33 teachers. There is less difference between the assistant superintendents' estimate of the number of teachers supervised at the secondary level (60), and actual numbers reported by central office supervisors (71.39). The average number of teachers actually supervised by central office supervisors varies from a low of 58.20 secondary teachers per supervisor in a small district, to a high of 171 elementary teachers in a large district. In a few cases, supervisors with both elementary and secondary responsibilities may supervise as many as 275 teachers. Across all levels, the average number of teachers supervised by a central office supervisor is 94.

Table 5 shows the average number of teachers supervised by school-based staff. On average, elementary principals supervise a few as 19 or 20 teachers in small and medium districts, but secondary principals supervise as many as

Table 4

Average Number of Teachers Supervised at Elementary and Secondary Levels, by Central Office Supervisors, by District Size

Respondent Role	Average number of Teachers Supervised by District Size							
	Large		Medium		Small		Total	
	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean
(Elementary)								
Assistant Superintendents*	2	64.00	5	101.00	8	78.25	15	83.93
Central Office Supervisors	3	171.00	6	93.50	0	0	9	119.33
(Secondary)								
Assistant Superintendents*	2	65.00	7	55.71	7	62.86	16	60.00
Central Office Supervisors	2	90.50	6	87.00	10	58.20	18	71.39
(Elementary and/ or Secondary)								
Assistant Superintendents	not applicable							
Central Office Supervisor	1	275.00	1	48.00	3	111.67	5	131.02

* Assistant superintendents stated their perceptions of central office supervisors' assignments.

Table 5

Average Number of Teachers Supervised at Elementary and Secondary Levels, by School-Based Staff, by District Size

Respondent Role	Average number of Teachers Supervised by District Size							
	Large		Medium		Small		Total	
	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean
(Elementary) Principals	4	29.75	6	20.00	5	19.50	15	22.43
(Secondary) Principals	4	61.25	4	61.00	5	34.60	13	50.92
(Elementary and/ or Secondary)								
Building Supervisor	0	0	2	39.50	3	36.00	5	37.78
Helping Teacher	4	105.25	2	99.00	0	0	6	103.17

61 or 62 teachers in medium or large districts. Supervisory tasks are also carried out by others, such as helping teachers or vice principals. In single school buildings, such staff supervise about 38 teachers, but if they work across several schools they supervise 103 teachers, on average.

Comparison by district size indicates that, in general, the larger the district the greater the number of teachers assigned to a single supervisor. It is interesting to note that small districts do not use helping teachers, nor do they report having central office staff working solely with elementary teachers. (This might contribute to cross-grade articulation.) Large districts report no building level supervisors. However, other data sources indicate that department heads do participate in teacher supervision in districts of various sizes, and that some small LEAs do assign central office supervisors to either elementary or secondary levels.

The quality of supervision is affected by the time spent and number of teachers supervised. Central office supervisors (100% time in this role) spend about 30% of their time (61 days) on observation and assistance, and 5% on evaluation.* On average, a central office supervisor supervises 94 teachers, which means that he/she can spend up to four hours a year in direct interaction with each teacher (assuming minimal travel and efficient time management). Principals and other school-based supervisors spend about 31% of their time (63 days) observing and assisting teachers and 8.7% on evaluation. On average, a principal supervises 36 teachers, and can spend almost two days a year in direct interaction. Other supervisory staff can spend between two hours and two days with each teacher. Infrequent brief interaction may be

---

* Travel time is included in these time allocations.

effective when the supervisor has built rapport with most of the (94) teachers over time, but if teacher turnover is high, or supervisors are reassigned often, difficulties are likely to be encountered. The ratio of time and teachers seems to offer greater opportunity for impact by principals than by central office supervisors.

Number of Schools Visited

The number of buildings a supervisor must visit also has an important effect on supervision. According to the survey, the average number of schools assigned to a supervisor is 7.32, ranging from a low of 2.46 schools for school-based staff in medium-size districts, to a high of 11.83 schools for central office supervisors in large-sized districts. (See Table 6.) The assistant superintendents' estimates for number of schools visited by a central office supervisor range from a low of 6 schools in small districts to a high of 14 schools in large districts. The time that supervisors invest in traveling reduces the 30% of their time which they spend on observation and assistance. While articulation of the curriculum and knowledge of a range of teaching strategies is enhanced by communication across schools, current practices indicate a need for more effective management of schedules and school assignments.

Number of People Supervising a Teacher

The average number of individuals supervising/evaluating a teacher is reported in Table 7 by the role groups responding to the survey in large, medium, and small districts. Within districts of the same size, there are discrepancies between the role groups' survey responses, reflecting variation of practice within a given district. For instance, two schools in the same district may have teachers supervised by only two people (e.g., principal and

Table 6

Average Number of Schools Visited by Central Office and School-Based Supervisors, According to the Size of the District

District Size	Assistant Superintendents' (Perceptions)*		Central Office Supervisors		School-Based Staff		Total	
	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean
Large	2	14.00	6	11.83	12	7.58	20	9.50
Medium	7	9.14	13	10.92	14	4.71	34	8.00
Small	7	6.00	13	7.77	13	2.46	33	53.03
Total	16	8.38	32	9.81	39	4.85	87	7.32

* Assistant Superintendents do not visit schools to supervise teachers. These data present their perceptions of the number of schools visited by the average central office supervisor.

Table 7

Average Number of People Supervising/Evaluating a Teacher

District Size	Assistant Superintendents' (Perceptions)*		Central Office Supervisors		School-Based Staff		Total	
	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean
Large	2	2.50	6	2.83	12	2.00	20	2.30
Medium	7	1.86	13	2.15	14	2.14	34	2.09
Small	8	2.38	13	2.54	13	2.38	33	2.44
Total	17	2.18	32	2.44	39	2.18	87	2.27

* Assistant superintendents do not supervise teachers. These data present their perceptions of the number of people supervising/evaluating a teacher.

area supervisor), or by as many as five people, depending on such factors as supervisor conscientiousness, teacher maturity or capability, size of school, availability of resource teachers, and the principal's relationship with "outsiders." Thus, teachers can expect at least two people to be advising them about how to improve their work, and may interact with even more. They are most likely to react to the "authority" closest to them, responding to the program expertise of department heads or similar others. They may experience conflict if messages given differ among various supervisors, and feel torn between what appears to be accountability issues (usually raised by the principal), and more immediate concerns of curriculum or instruction (usually raised by department heads or central office supervisors). These reactions indicate that it is extremely important for all supervisors to define their roles, coordinate activities, and share a common philosophy and set of priorities.

Common Understanding of Supervision

An effective supervisory process depends upon a commonly shared understanding among all staff as to the philosophy, purpose, and process of supervision. For instance, an LEA may believe that the purpose of supervision is to guide and assist teachers in improving the quality of instruction, and that the process includes both data-based decision-making and systematic activities (such as training, coaching, and curriculum and staff development). This section reports the responses to a survey question about such common understandings.

On average, there is a moderate degree of common understanding across role groups. (See Table 8.) An analysis of the open-ended comments to the same question indicates a divided opinion among respondents regarding clarity;

although some supervisors feel that a clear understanding about supervision has been achieved in their district, the majority state there is room for improvement.

Table 8

Perceptions about Common Understanding of Purpose, Philosophy, and Process of Supervision

Responses	Roles Groups		
	Assistant Superintendents (N=17)	Central Office Supervisors (N=31)	School-Based Staff (N=38)
Positive comments about the understanding of supervision.	8	8	11
Negative or qualified comments about the understanding of supervision.	6	15	12
Neutral or no comment about the understanding of supervision.	3	8	15

For example, central office supervisors stated:

- There is a need to make clear the purpose of supervision; the promotion of teachers' growth in effective instruction (formative evaluation). Therefore, we must make clear the similarities and differences between formative and summative evaluation (rating). Classroom supervision is still perceived as rating, or even punitive, and not as a part of the learning process. There is a need to understand the two discrete functions of the supervisory conference.
- The teachers feel it is perfectly clear that it seems overly negative.
- In a large pluralistic organization, the variety and thrust of multiple goals contribute to varieties of interpretation and implementation.
- Supervisors and principals at the elementary level have a similar understanding of "supervision;" howe[illegible] some situations have led teachers to doubt the expressed purp[illegible]

School-based supervisors said:

- Since the role of supervision at any level has not been defined and/or is often misinterpreted, there is little reason to suspect it is understood.
- Principals and central office staff view supervision as an improvement process, while teachers tend to look on supervision as a monitoring process.

Assistant superintendents commented:

- In an attempt to be all things to all people, efforts become so diffused that there is too often no clear definition of purpose.
- Supervisors know the components and try to convey them; some teachers understand the role but little is done by upper levels to provide support with citizens or fiscal authorities.
- Most A&S personnel know our philosophy and process. Some of them, however, do not convey this to teachers. Some principals are reluctant to observe classes and try to use supervisors as the "heavies" in evaluations of teachers.
- A number of issues cloud the matter: What is the authority of supervisors? Where is the supervisor in the hierarchy? Should they evaluate? Generalist or specialist? K-12 vs. elementary or secondary?

Table 9 presents the survey results related to philosophic beliefs about supervision. Across the school system, most people believe: "supervision and evaluation of teachers are linked by common criteria but separated in time and purpose" (mean of 3.61), and "supervision and evaluation are essentially the same thing" (3.60). The answers are contradictory. Most authorities on supervision/evaluation would accept the first answer as part of a positive philosophy of supervision, and say that the second rating reflects the negative impact of supervision equated with summative teacher evaluation. Moderately high ratings on two additional items, "supervision is primarily a pro forma monitoring process" (3.48) and "supervision is primarily an accountability process" (3.54), reinforce a philosophy of supervision (as practiced) that centers around summative evaluation. The least practiced

supervisory beliefs are: (1) "supervision and evaluation are totally separate activities" (2.19), and (2) "supervision is primarily an improvement process" (3.28). These responses suggest that in practice supervision and evaluation are closely entwined, and an important stated goal of the teacher supervision/evaluation process in many LEAs, namely, the improvement of teaching, is not being implemented.

Table 9

Practice and Preference about the Nature of Supervision

Survey Item	Ratings	
	Practice N=86 Mean	Preference N=84 Mean
Across the school system, most people believe:		
supervision is primarily an improvement process	3.28	4.73
supervision is primarily a pro forma pro forma monitoring process	3.48	3.07
supervision is primarily an accountability process	3.54	3.24
supervision and evaluation are essentially the same thing	3.60	2.60
supervision and evaluation are linked by common criteria but separated in time and purpose	3.61	3.90
supervision and evaluation are totally separate activities.	2.19	2.94

Scale ranges from 1.00 (minimal) to 5.00 (high agreement).

Some significant differences in responses are seen between role groups and sizes of districts. School-based staff believe that "supervision is primarily a pro forma monitoring process," to a greater degree than do assistant superintendents (means of 3.71 and 2.81, respectively). The pattern of response (if not the relative difference), holds true for "supervision is primarily an accountability process" (school-based staff: 3.82; assistant superintendents: 3.13), and "supervision and evaluation of teachers are essentially the same thing" (school-based staff: 3.75; assistant superintendents: 3.13). These differences suggest a conflict in practice that could be crucial to the issue of supervision. Since teachers are most influenced by those in close and frequent contact, they more readily believe the messages of school-based staff, who indicate that supervision is not a process of improvement but an exercise in accountability.

Ratings for the most practiced belief within a role group show that central office administrators believe that "supervision and evaluation of teachers are essentially the same thing" (3.65). School-based supervisors believe that "supervision is primarily an accountability process" (3.82), and assistant superintendents believe that "supervision and evaluation are linked by common criteria but separated in time and purpose" (3.94). All three groups agree that the least practiced philosophy is that supervision and evaluation are totally separate activities (mean for central office supervisors is 1.97, for school-based staff is 2.33, for assistant superintendents is 2.31).

One significant difference between two sizes of districts is apparent. Respondents in small districts believe that supervision is primarily pro forma monitoring to a greater extent than do supervisors in large districts (means of 3.67 and 2.95, respectively).

Looking at both size and role, a pattern of difference emerges for the responses by central office supervisors. In large districts, they believe that: (1) "supervision is primarily an improvement process" (3.83) to a greater degree than does the same role group in medium-size districts (2.92); (2) "supervision is primarily a pro forma monitoring process" (2.67) to a lesser extent than central office supervisors in medium (3.67) and small-size districts (3.85); (3) "supervision and evaluation of teachers are essentially the same thing" (3.00) less often than their peers in small districts (3.92); and (4) "supervision and evaluation are totally separate activities" (2.83) more often than members of the same role group in medium-size districts (1.75). This pattern of response seems to suggest that central office supervisors in large districts think that formative and summative evaluation have been separated in the supervisory processes of their LEAs. A similar understanding (with less dramatic differences) seems apparent in the responses of assistant superintendents of large districts. However, the sample size (N=2) is too small to draw a firm conclusion.

Whereas, in general, ratings for practice suggest a philosophy based on supervision as pro forma monitoring, an accountability process, or supervision equal to evaluation, ratings for preference clearly display a belief in supervision as primarily an improvement process, a belief held consistently by all role groups. These findings suggest discrepancies, some of which may be addressed by improving communication within an LEA. In other cases, however discrepancies may need to be addressed by redesigning organizational arrangements for supervision.

Organizational Arrangements

Organizational arrangements for teacher supervision and evaluation include formal hierarchical systems such as may be illustrated in

organizational charts or indicated in job descriptions, as well as mechanisms established to coordinate and carry out the tasks involved. Arrangements are influenced by the LEA's philosophy, their operating assumptions about an effective organization, and perceived purposes of supervision and evaluation; the ways in which those beliefs are related to curriculum and staff development; and by operating constraints such as district size, contract agreements, and resource allocations. Arrangements and their relative effectiveness are made more complex when LEAs try to establish a single set of constructs to satisfy the different purposes of evaluation and supervision.* Some LEAs confound the issue by overtly stating that the objectives of evaluation include both personnel appraisal and improvement of practice. While evaluation may include data collection and analysis, and established procedures might ensure that findings are reviewed with teachers, those activities often do not result in behavioral change. Therefore, it is inappropriate to state that evaluation will meet the objective of improvement of teacher quality.

In most Maryland LEAs, organizational charts indicate that teachers report to principals, and that A&S staff report to superintendents (in small districts) or assistant superintendents (in large districts). Such a reporting system suggests arrangements for staff evaluation (annual

---

* As Darling-Hammond et al. (1983) point out, summative evaluation may be used in personnel decision-making, is related to accountability (due process), and for that reason must be fairly standardized. Formative evaluation (developmental assessment) on the other hand, is improvement oriented and context specific. Changing teacher performance (the purpose of supervision) involves processes that may be inconsistent with those used to derive evaluative judgements. While both supervision and evaluation may require supervisors to carry out similar activities (e.g., classroom observation and review of lesson plans), since the purposes are different, task definition should differ. However, it is more common to find school systems and staff attempting to force-fit tasks and purposes, and making organizational arrangements accordingly.

performance appraisal). Just as a supervisor's annual review (by the superintendent) may be informed by an assistant superintendent, a teacher's review may be informed by a vice principal or department head. Such arrangements seem logical if the review is to be adequately informed (and assuming that those providing information have interacted frequently on various kinds of tasks with the staff person being reviewed). Supposedly, the purpose of evaluation is thus served.

However, issues of relative expertise and influence are raised, and others enter the system -- subject area supervisors in secondary schools, especially where there are no department heads; and resource specialists or general supervisors in elementary schools. These people may each visit a classroom only once a year, but, nevertheless, provide input for the teacher's annual review.

Supervisory arrangements are more varied and complex. A teacher may be advised by a team leader or department head, vice principal and principal, regional supervisor, and central office specialist or supervisor. While secondary teachers may feel allegiance to content specialists, elementary teachers may be more responsive to the general expertise of their principals. Those most in need of help turn to the most accessible source, and may be more influenced by informal contacts than by formal systems. In some cases, mixed messages from various sources may result in the teacher ignoring all of them.

Recognizing these issues, each LEA has designed its own way of organizing for supervision. In some cases, organizational systems or models evolve through tradition or expediency. In other cases, purposeful planning results in redesign. Firth and Eiken (1982) analyzed seven organizational models, six of which are found in Maryland LEAs.* (See Table 10.) These models are not

---

* Intemediate Service Agencies are not part of the state structure.

Table 10

Alternative Models of Organizing for Supervision*

Models	Organizational Assumptions	Skills	Decision-Making	Influences on Effectiveness
Staff Consultant Roles	An effective organization distinguishes and separates those who advise from those who direct.	Human, managerial, technical, with emphasis on instructional competence, communicating as an information broker.	Advisory, sympathetic to teachers' cause, can persuade but may be over-ruled by administrative expediency.	Needs good relationships with principals and teachers, flexibility to respond to school needs; must be supported by LEA commitment to instructional improvement.
Line Authority Roles	An effective organization combines authority and responsibility for various operations in the same position.	Administrative, managerial technical (curriculum and supervision), balancing supervisory responsibilities with management decisions.	Administrative, with potential for linking curriculum, instruction, and administration, if incumbent's expertise and values so develop.	Needs to overcome barriers to teachers' concerns, incumbent's authoritarian behavior; must enhance skills in curriculum and supervision to balance competition for energy easily invested in management.
Multiple Central Office Units	An effective organization fully utilizes specialization	Each incumbent has highly specialized technical skills (e.g., art, music, reading, career education, special ed.).	Advocate for speciality, stressing distinguishing characteristics of curriculum unit; reluctant to co-ordinate across total instructional program.	Needs to balance specific curriculum commitment with total curriculum design to reduce conflict and competition; must collaborate if supervision is to assist rather than disrupt.

* Based on Firth & Eiken, 1982.

Table 10 (continued)

Models	Organizational Assumptions	Skills	Decision-Making	Influences on Effectiveness
Dentralized Area Support Roles	An effective organization assigns responsibility close to the operational level.	Specialist-turned-generalist, technical skills relating to general instructional program and inservice.	Programmatic, facilitating regional involvement in curriculum, responding to school priorities with long-range district goals.	Needs to maintain multiple communication channels, provide technical assistance for program development; must avoid being co-opted into purposeless directives or retreating into minor areas of speciality.
Performance Assessment Roles	An effective organization separates responsibility for evaluation from responsibility for support.	Collection, analysis, feedback of data with measures & methods to observe classroom performance; skills in goal setting and monitoring.	Analytic, rational, prescribed, corrective, focusing specified standards and actions to be taken for improvement --assessment results determine assistance given.	Needs to acknowledge limits of measures/standards used with subsequent investment on certain instructional areas, sometimes at the expense of teacher-felt-needs or curriculum. Relative value is determined by the nature of the assessment measure and methods used.
Local School Support Roles	An effective organization uses people immediately available and familiar with the situation.	Technical teaching skills held by incumbents (department heads, vice principals, resource teachers) plus acquired skill in assisting others.	Autonomous, within subject or grade level team, reshaping program without principal's involvement, sometimes deciding to do nothing despite teacher needs.	Needs to clearly define role parameters, build communication and coordination mechanisms, avoid competition among departments; must build incumbent integrity.
Intermediate Service Agency Roles	An effective organization shares specialized services rather than duplicates general resources.	Wide ranging with in agency; specialists, generalists, etc.	Distant, advisory, external to the school and system, often dependent on informal influence.	Needs to acknowledge complexities of "layers" of supervision, of individual preference on service delivery, and of potential inter-organization conflict of expertise or authority. Relative value is influenced by inter-organization relationships negotiated, and extent of redundancy or reinformcement between supervisory groups.

necessarily mutually exclusive, but when two or more are combined, their effectiveness is affected by the extent to which individual and organizational underlying assumptions are aligned. For instance, many central office supervisors in Maryland prefer the staff consultant role, seeing themselves as advisors "in white hats," but in several LEAs the organizational assumptions put them in line authority roles to combine evaluation (black hat) with supervision (white hat). The assumptions of the two models are in conflict, which requires incumbents to develop considerable expertise to accomplish role effectiveness.

The models of multiple central office units and decentralized area support are popular in large school systems. When both are used together, there is great conflict of organizational assumptions and incumbent skills, requiring leadership which excells in collaboration and complex coordination if the system is to be effective. Without such coordination the two models operate independently, and ultimate impact on instruction is patchy.

The models of performance assessment and staff consultant are compatible to some extent; the conflict lies between the structure of the former and the flexibility of the latter. Maryland LEAs combining these models do maintain a balance, finding it easier to do so without a rigid checklist of criteria, instead using general guidelines or categories of teacher responsibility.

Local school support roles are used informally in all schools, because the assumptions reflect reality. When the model is formally recognized, and incumbents participate in task clarification, skill development, and coordinating activities, effectiveness is likely to be greater than when the model is used informally. This model is used in combination with others in Maryland

LEAs, since alone it isolates schools from each other and increases department or school autonomy (possibly at the expense of curriculum fidelity or articulation).

Each of the seven models identified by Firth and Eiken has advantages and disadvantages in various areas. They are outlined in Table 11. Review of organizational arrangements in Maryland LEAs indicates that no one uses a single model, and that some need to attend to the disadvantages being practiced.

Two examples of local arrangements are described in Table 12, following the same framework as in Table 10.* The first model, Interactive Teams, involves department heads or team leaders as school-based technical specialists, and principals and central office supervisors as generalists. All three role group representatives are collegial, agree on parameters of responsibility, and use a common knowledge base. The principal is primarily responsible for evaluation and may suggest that areas to be improved are addressed by the department head (who does not evaluate). Each team member participates in training and planning with counterparts from other schools and subject areas, contributing to district wide coordination of curriculum and instruction as well as supervision and evaluation. Effectiveness is influenced by the extent to which team members use a common knowledge base, apply effective communication, establish parameters of responsibility and collegial relationships, and maintain professional integrity. The potential conflict between school needs and central office preferences needs to be acknowledged to guard against inequities of resource allocation (including staff time) and use of administrative authority.

---

* These descriptions present the intended ideal. Problems and disadvantages are not discussed.

Table 11*

Summary of Advantages and Disadvantages Regarding Seven Common Bureaucratic Models for Supervision of Instruction

	Supervisory Patterns						
Area of Impact	Staff Consultant	Line Authority	Multiple Central Office Support	Decentralized Area Support	Performance Assessment	Local School Support	Intermediate Service Agency Support
Leadership	Determines resource allocation but dependent on administrative priorities	Combines supervision with management but creates superior-subordinate relationship	Distributes responsibility for specific programs but encourages formation of competing coalitions	Accommodates to needs of different areas but dependent on style and tone set in each	Provides focus to assistance but limited by factors included in assessment	Delegates responsibility for supervision but delegates most important functions	Provides additional options but requires appropriate selection
Technical Skills	Enhances opportunities for influence but dependent on requests from teachers or principals	Emphasizes managerial skills but requires on-the-job development of technical skills for supervision	Utilizes specialized skills but reduces opportunities for collaboration	Diffuses potential assistance but reduces resources available to a particular area	Utilizes those related to standards but neglects others needed by teachers	Provides on-the-job training but diminishes other types of skills	Supplements available services but duplicates some existing local skills
Communication	Encourages linkages as information broker but dependent upon administration for access to official channels	Establishes authenticity of messages but restricts information considered detrimental	Encourages interaction among peers but decreases interaction between members of different units	Increases knowledge of local situation but reduces contact with central office	Emphasizes assessment results but ignores other topics of importance to teachers	Increases interaction with teachers but reduces contact between teacher and principal	Offers additional information but provides contradictory views.
Decision Making	Minimizes rash solutions with alternatives but dependent on persuasion of administrators	Clarifies prerogatives for supervision but compromises by management responsibilities	Permits consideration of varied alternatives but encourages protection of parochial interests	Encourages broad base of involvement but risks loss of district policy integrity	Contributes to improved performance but limits attention to items in assessment	Encourages initiative by subordinates but removes decision from principal	Retains local prerogatives but questions loyalty of agency staff
Morale Functions	Provides sympathetic ally but dependent on others to alter circumstances	Possesses ability to resolve teacher problems but considered reluctant to do so	Promotes teamwork within unit but fosters suspicion between members of different units	Increases opportunities for assistance but dependent on resource availability	Establishes standard for assessment but distrusted due to general application	Enhances opportunities for assistance but confuses teacher allegiance	Enhances importance of supervision but requires request for assistance
Curriculum Responsibilities	Contributes to program development but limits opportunities to assist teachers	Accepts assignments readily but lacks appropriate qualifications	Encourages attention to each subject area but restricts consideration of total program	Increases responsiveness to local program needs but threatens total district direction	Promotes change for similarity but produces unstructured diversity	Increases potential for change but presents marshaling of resources	Addresses particular concerns but may compromise district goals
Organizational Roles	Potential related to resource control but limited to relationships with principals	Possesses power to modify situation but holds allegiance to existing structure	Distinguishes particular characteristic but threatens collaborative efforts	Provides team for particular area but increases tendency for supervisors to become part of management	Shapes organization to assessment but shifts responsibility for supervision	Frees principal for other duties but introduces additional level of structure	Promotes mutually supporting structure but requires clear distribution of responsibility
Value Assumption	Advise and counsel should be separate from power and direction	Power and responsibility for related operations should be combined	Specialization should be fully utilized	Responsibility should be assigned close to the operational level	Responsibility for evaluation and support functions should be separated	Sources of support should be immediately available and familiar with local situation	Resources should be shared rather than duplicated

* from: Firth & Eiken (1982)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 12

Examples of Organizational Models in Maryland

Models	Organizational Assumptions	Skills	Decision-Making	Influences on Effectiveness
Interactive Teams	An effective organization links technical specialists with line managers to accomplish diverse purposes.	Technical, human, managerial: core skills common to all incumbents, each incumbent stressing a different primary skill. All disposed to coordinate.	Purpose-specific, goal-directed, interactive -- assistance provided influenced by assessment of individual, by school and district curriculum activity, and by administrative expediency.	Needs to develop and maintain common knowledge base, effective communication, clear parameters of responsibility within team, collegial relationships among incumbents, and high integrity. May need to negotiate parameters of authority and resource allocation (school vs. central office).
Decentralized Support	An effective organization assigns responsibility at the operational level, linking purposes and positions.	Specialist-turned-generalist, with managerial, technical, and human skills, balancing varied tasks (a "linker," facilitator, or internal change agent).	Rational, goal-directed -- assistance determined by assessment of individual, linked to school and system curriculum and instruction.	Primary incumbent needs to build teacher trust, and develop and maintain excellent skills as a "linker" on several dimensions; must balance responses to demands of school vs. central office which may conflict with each other.

SJEALIVA 90C T2S8

The second model, Decentralized Support, locates central office supervisors in schools with the dual responsibilities of vice principal and curriculum and instructional supervisor.* While the principal is responsible for evaluation, and influences the assistance provided, the "linker" is also responsive to teachers' needs and is pro-active in pressing for application of LEA curriculum and instruction priorities. Effectiveness is influenced by the extent to which incumbents can balance the various demands of system, school, and teacher; develop and apply a broad set of skills (maintaining consistency across the LEA); and build and maintain teachers' trust.

No single organizational model is likely to be appropriate for all districts. However, all districts need to take into account the same issues, considering the potential advantages and disadvantages of management decisions. As indicated in this section of the report, those decisions relate to: (1) resource allocation, that is, the ratio of teachers to supervisors (and vice versa), and the number of schools visited; (2) staffing, that is, the individuals and role groups involved and how they coordinate their responsibilities; and (3) task coordination, that is, the extent to which incumbents share a common understanding of the philosophy, purpose, and practice of supervision. Ideally, these decisions should be based on a philosophy or operating assumptions relating to effective organizations, schools, and classrooms, and to the personal and organizational perspectives brought to bear in professional relationships. Therefore, in any initiative to change any aspect of supervision and evaluation, representatives of role groups affected should be involved in planning that change. A process of strategic interactive planning (Ackoff, 1977) might be used, allowing

---

* This "linker" role is similar to the Project Basic Facilitator role, which located MSDE staff in LEAs to assist in program implementation.

participants to define the existing system and determine operating assumptions before setting up new arrangements, activities, or techniques. The nature of supervision from an individual incumbent's perspective should be defined in conjunction with the organizational design.

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF SUPERVISORS

This chapter discusses responsibilities specifically related to direct supervision, use of supervisory time, and observance of and assistance to teachers. A fourth section suggests improvement possibilities. The perspective is primarily from the point of view of the individual supervisor.

Supervisory Responsibilities

The responsibilities of supervisors are described in job descriptions and are otherwise suggested by incumbents who indicate their perceptions of practice and preference with respect to the various knowledge, skills, and activities relating to supervision. Relationships between responsibilities and those things for which supervisors are held accountable are also discussed.

Job Descriptions

Job descriptions were submitted by 11 LEAs for central office instructional supervisors -- both generalist and subject specialist positions. Descriptions were also submitted for principals, vice principals, and teachers. In general, job descriptions are lists of duties or responsibilities including curriculum development, staff development, teacher supervision, and administration. Specificity varies from "observes and evaluates instruction," to "observes the in-class performance of middle school teachers, and confers and consults with them regarding their performance, teaching ability, and their professional development." (Neither of these examples suggests that the supervisor is accountable for helping the teacher to become more effective.) Items are not usually categorized (as is suggested by Saif (1976), who provides four general categories or areas of accountability for principals). Job descriptions average 30 items for principals and vice

principals, and 18 for central office staff. There is a general match between job description items and the 14 behaviors on which supervisors spend their time. However, none of the job descriptions suggests primary accountabilities, how the tasks might be prioritized, or how an individual would or should divide her/his time among the many duties listed. They neither specify how any of the tasks should be carried out, nor give criteria for judging effective performance in the position. Job descriptions can be used to clarify and differentiate supervisory roles and responsibilities. (See Oliva (1984) for a variety of job descriptions.) The descriptions reviewed for this study did not do this systematically, although some used key operative verbs to indicate level of responsibility or interaction with others with similar tasks. ("Work with..." is an example of doubtful definition, but "Establish and maintain... with assistance from..." suggests greater clarity.)

Supervisors' Perceptions of Responsibilities

A general understanding of what supervisors do, the ways in which they identify needs and opportunities, the kinds of strategies they recommend, and the knowledge and skills they demonstrate are presented in Table 13. Mean ratings of practice and preference are given (on a five point scale where 1.00 = minimal and 5.00 = high agreement). Of the five general areas relating to direct supervision, there is strongest agreement that supervisors "monitor teachers' progress, paying greater attention to those who are less effective or new," and lowest agreement that supervisors discuss/coordinate among each other to "contribute to teachers' annual evaluation." Preferences are high for all five areas, with a strong desire for teachers to have a common understanding of the supervisory process. The highest ratings for specific practice are: "identify needs and opportunities by observing in the classroom" (4.67), "identify needs and opportunities by talking with the

Table 13

Ratings of General Understanding of Activity Relating to Direct Supervision

Survey Item	Practice (N=85) Mean	Preference (N=85) Mean
General Activity Areas		
1. Ensure teachers have common understanding of the supervisory process	4.05	4.79
2. Identify teachers' area of need or opportunities for professional growth	3.91	4.60
3. Systematically discuss needs, recommending actions leading to improvement	3.92	4.66
4. Systematically discuss needs with principal (or relevant others) contributing to teachers' annual evaluation	3.82	4.63
5. Monitor teachers' progress, paying greater attention to those who are less effective or new	4.28	4.75
Specific Activities		
6. Identify needs and opportunities by:		
a. observing in the classroom	4.67	4.87
b. reviewing lessons	3.69	4.35
c. talking with the teacher	4.35	4.81
d. talking with the principal	3.91	4.48
e. talking with relevant others	3.28	4.06
f. analyzing student grades, test scores	2.89	3.76
g. comparing what the teacher does with what is recommended by the system	3.87	4.39
h. comparing what the teacher does with what is recommended by research on effective schools	3.21	4.06
i. comparing what the teacher does with what she/he planned to do	4.01	4.52
7. Offer recommendations including:		
a. school inservice	3.35	4.12
b. district inservice	3.61	4.38
c. individualized self-improvement activities negotiated through goal setting	3.37	4.35
d. involvement in curriculum development	3.56	4.18
e. lesson-specific techniques, activities	3.96	4.46
8. Demonstrate knowledge and skill in:		
a. interpersonal relationships	4.18	4.74
b. administration, record-keeping, organizing	4.09	4.45
c. teaching/learning	4.14	4.65
d. specific curriculum	4.16	4.56
e. management of planned change	3.77	4.48
f. application of research on classroom/ teacher effectiveness	3.36	4.45

Scale ranges from 1.00 (minimal) to 5.00 (high agreement)

teacher" (4.35). The least practiced activities are: "identify needs and opportunities by analyzing student grades, test scores" (2.89), "offer recommendations including school inservice" (3.35), and "identify needs and opportunities by comparing what the teacher does with what is recommended by research on effective schools" (3.21).

The most practiced supervisors' responsibilities are activities compatible with a traditional summative supervision/evaluation process, and two of the least practiced, "analyzing student grades, tests" and "comparing what the teacher does with the effective schools research" are part of a school effectiveness model of supervision.

In this category of the survey, there are significant differences in practices for large and medium-sized districts -- a pattern indicating that certain responsibilities are carried out most often in large-sized school districts and least often in medium-size districts. Such differences occur on the following items:

- "identify needs and opportunities by talking with principal" (means of 4.43 for large, and 3.44 for medium school districts)
- "offer recommendations including school inservice" (means of 4.21 for large, and 3.00 for medium school districts)
- "offer recommendations including individualized self-improvement activities negotiated through goal setting" (means of 4.21 for large and 3.00 for medium school districts).

A possible explanation of this pattern might be that teacher activity in large LEAs is focused to a greater extent in the school while activity in medium sized districts may be more centralized.

The highest ratings of preference (see Table 13) are: "identify needs and opportunities by observing in the classroom" (4.87), and "talking with the teacher" (4.81). The least preferred activities are: "identify needs and opportunities by analyzing student grades, test scores" (3.76), "identify

needs and opportunities by talking with relevant others" (4.06), and "identify needs and opportunities by comparing what the teacher does with what is recommended by research on effective schools" (4.06). The item which shows the greatest difference between what is practiced and what is preferred is "demonstrates knowledge and skill in application on classroom/teacher effectiveness" (means of 3.36 and 4.45, respectively). Another item which shows a large difference between practice and preference is the item which is related to the clinical supervision and goal setting models, "offers recommendations including individualized self-improvement activities negotiated through goal setting" (means of 3.37 and 4.35, respectively). Apparently supervisors like to be fairly independent, don't like using test data, but want to develop greater expertise in applying relevant research and contributing to teachers' professional growth. The discrepancies between practice and preference relating to demonstrated knowledge and skills suggest that supervisors may also want to explore opportunities for their own professional growth.

Responsibilities and Accountabilities

The activities carried out by supervisors should relate to their responsibilities which, in turn, should match those areas for which they are held accountable.* The categories of responsibility most frequently mentioned by central office supervisors (in descending order) are: curriculum/program development or implementation, helping (supervising) teachers, and assessing teachers. The focus of their actions appears to be seen as interacting with teachers individually. The responses from school-based supervisors fall most

---

* Survey questions were: (1) According to your job description (or understanding of your job), what is your primary responsibility in terms of supervisors, i.e., what are you supposed to do? and (2) In terms of supervision, what is your primary accountability, i.e., what is it your immediate supervisor expects you to get done?

often into the categories of instructional leadership, teacher assessment, and helping (supervising) teachers. The focus for these responsibilities appears to be more generally on the school as an organization or teachers as a group, rather than on teachers as individuals. Individuals in both groups often mention more than one category and they usually feel that their responsibilities match their accountabilities. Responsibilities and accountabilities are most often expressed in extremely general terms. Several individuals interpret their accountabilities more narrowly than their responsibilities. Others voice their frustration over the discrepancy between the two.

For example, one principal states that his/her primary responsibility is to "provide for the constant evaluation, maintenance, and improvement of the instruction which occurs in my school." His/her primary accountability is to "encourage and nurture good teachers, help them grow professionally, and weed out ineffective teachers if all modes of help do not produce desired results." He/she seems to feel a tension between the overall instructional program and identification of individual teachers' competence. Another principal expresses parallel responsibility and accountability by saying his/her responsibility is to "evaluate, supervise, and observe 21 teachers with the purpose of improving instruction through professional growth." His/her accountability is to "use a goal-setting process which supports professional growth. This learning is enhanced by developing better instructional strategies and programs."

Although most central office supervisors believe that their responsibilities generally match their accountabilities, several express frustration. One lists his/her primary responsibility as "leading curriculum development, coordinating the instructional program, providing instructional materials, and inservicing teachers." His/her accountability is: "Everything! Lip service

is given to the fact that we are supposed to work in the schools 80%. However, all other demands make this impossible." Another describes his/her responsibilities as curriculum development and implementation and evaluation of teachers. His/her accountability is "not clearly defined; what I do is accepted." A third states his/her responsibilities are assisting teachers in developing more effective teacher strategies, and developing and implementing curriculum. His/her accountability is "responding to a wide variety of imposed priorities."

The general picture of supervisory responsibility that emerges is one that is influenced by curriculum development activities as well as direct teacher assistance. As in any administrative position, there is a tension between the needs of the individual (teacher) and the demands of the program. Responsibilities and accountabilities are described in general rather than specific terms by supervisors themselves. Job descriptions do not always match activities. Most supervisors view their responsibilities within a context of summative supervision/evaluation process, and there is little evidence that incumbents are successful in creating "double-win" strategies to link tasks of direct supervision of individual teachers with tasks of curriculum or program development and administration.* The low degree of interaction among supervisors reinforces the concern about common understandings or shared philosophy about supervision and the improvement of practice.

---

* It should be noted that anecdotal information identifies some individual examples of excellent linkage of tasks and people, but these are isolated and not systemically applied.

The Use of Supervisory Time

Time analysis provides useful information on which activities are receiving the most supervisory attention. It helps decision-makers set or realign priorities, and it is the foundation for planning more effective use of available time. This section reports on supervisory use of time as indicated by survey data, refers to relevant literature, and discusses how organizational influences impact supervisory time.

Respondents to the survey were asked to account for their use of time and also give their preference for how their time should be spent. Specifically, central office supervisors accounted for 100% of their time (using a 200 work-day year as a base) and assistant superintendents estimated the time expenditures of central office supervisors in a similar manner. School-based supervisors were asked to determine the percentage of time spent on supervisory tasks, and to subdivide that time. Several respondents had difficulty in estimating their time so that results added up to 100%. Responses that totaled more than 115% were discarded.

Table 14 presents use of time by central office supervisors, in terms of practice and preference. It also rank orders each activity so the allocations of time can more easily be compared, both in terms of practice and in terms of preference. On the average, over 55% of their time is spent on the first three activities: observing and assisting teachers -- 30.67% (61.34 days); attending meetings -- 14.38% (28.76 days); and developing or reviewing curriculum -- 10.27% (20.54 days).* Not surprisingly, the largest amount of time is spent on observing and assisting teachers. However, the total time spent in interacting with teachers and related instructional concerns

---

* These functions are similar to those reported in the ASCD pilot study by Blumberg (1984).

Table 14

Practice and Preference of
Central Office Supervisors' Use of Time

Activity	Practice (N=31)			Preference (N=28)		
	#Days	%Time	Rank	#Days	%Time	Rank
Observe and assist teachers	61.34	30.67	1	75.06	37.53	1
Attend meetings	28.76	14.38	2	22.36	11.18	3
Develop/review curriculum	20.54	10.27	3	24.94	12.47	2
Write proposals, plans, reports, keep records	16.50	8.25	4	7.34	3.67	8
Plan/conduct staff development/inservice	15.08	7.53	5	19.86	9.93	4
Evaluate teachers	10.80	5.40	6	10.82	5.41	6
Manage/assist with state or federal programs	8.12	4.06	7	3.62	1.80	12
Interact with parents/ community	7.42	3.71	8	9.50	4.75	7
Participate in MSDE initiatives and other "out of system" activities	7.12	3.56	9	5.58	2.79	9
Plan/conduct "events" or summer programs	7.10	3.55	10	5.08	2.54	10
Learn (e.g., by reading, attending staff development activities, "trading places" with school staff)	5.94	2.97	11	11.00	5.50	5
Test students, collect/ analyze test results	5.20	2.60	12	3.82	1.91	11
Other	2.76	1.38	13	1.28	.64	13
Negotiate Contracts	1.04	.53	14	.64	.32	14

Percentages are based on a "year" of 200 working days.

(observation/assistance, evaluation, staff and curriculum development, testing/analyzing results) accounts for slightly more than one-half of their time (approximately 57%). Central office supervisors report they have almost no time (2.97%) to learn new things about their work on the job. In fact, several respondents stated that they used their own time for this activity.

When stating preferences for use of time, central office supervisors said they would like to spend more time in the areas of observing/assisting teachers, planning/conducting inservice, reviewing curriculum, interacting with parents/community; about the same amount of time in evaluating teachers; and less time in all other areas (mostly administration). The same teacher interaction and instructional concerns as mentioned earlier would account for about 67% of their time if they carried out their preferences.

Assistant superintendents' estimate of central office supervisors' use of time is reported in Table 15. They estimate about 8% more time spent in observation/assistance of teachers and about 2% less time spent in attending meetings than do the supervisors themselves. Overall their estimates vary slightly from the supervisors self-reports in the importance given each area. There is general agreement between the two role groups on the six most time-consuming activities, with central office supervisors allocating 76.5% of their time, and assistant superintendents estimating 78.6%. It is interesting to note that the former would prefer to invest about 75 days observing and assisting teachers, and assistant superintendents think that 77 days are being invested and would prefer 92 days on that task. In general, assistant superintendents would prefer that supervisors spend more time in observing/assisting teachers, in staff and curriculum development, in interacting with parents/community, and in learning activities. They would prefer that supervisors spend less time in all other areas listed.

Table 15

Assistant Superintendents' Estimates of
Central Office Supervisors' Use of Time

Activity	Practice (N=15)			Preference (N=15)		
	#Days	%Time	Rank	#Days	%Time	Rank
Observe and assist teachers	77.46	38.73	1	92.26	46.13	1
Attend meetings	24.40	12.20	2	16.94	8.47	4
Develop/review curriculum	20.80	10.40	3	23.46	11.73	2
Evaluate teachers	12.80	6.40	4	12.26	6.13	5
Plan/conduct staff development/inservice	11.74	5.87	5	18.40	9.20	3
Write proposals, plans, reports, keep records	10.00	5.00	6	6.14	3.07	10
Participate in MSDE initiatives and other "out of system" activities	9.06	4.53	7	7.34	3.67	8=
Learn (e.g., by reading, attending staff development activities, "trading places" with other school staff)	8.80	4.40	8	11.20	5.60	6
Plan/conduct "events" (e.g., career fair, film festival), or summer programs	6.94	3.47	9	4.54	2.27	11
Manage/assist with state of federal programs	5.86	2.93	10	4.26	2.13	12
Other	4.54	2.27	11	10.66	5.33	7
Interact with parents/ community	4.14	2.07	12	7.34	3.67	8=
Test students, collect/ analyze test results	3.34	1.67	13	3.34	1.67	13
Negotiate contracts	1.06	.53	14	.54	.27	14

Percentages are based on "year" of 200 working days.

Table 16 presents data on the use of time by school-based supervisors (mainly principals). This group reports that on the average 29.65% (about 59 days) of their time is used in tasks not related to supervision of teachers (such as program and school management). Of their total time, 31.66% (63.32 days) is spent in observing/assisting teachers. As might be expected, this group spends more time than central office supervisors in evaluation activities and less on curriculum development. However, they spend slightly more time than central office supervisors on staff development. When the teacher-interaction activities and areas of instructional concern are added together (observation/assistance, staff and curriculum development, testing/analyzing results), they represent approximately the same time expenditure for school-based supervisors (59%) as for central office supervisors (57%). (It should be noted that the former group assists, on average, 36 teachers, in comparison to 94 assisted by central office supervisors.)

If they acted on their preferences, school-based administrators would spend more time observing/assisting teachers, in staff and curriculum development, and in learning activities, and less time in evaluation and non-supervisory tasks.

It is somewhat difficult to make comparisons between the use of time as reported in the survey and a typical supervisor's use of time, because there are only a few similar discussions of time expenditures within the professional literature. One of these investigations (Roberts, Friedman, & Maguire, 1982), an administrative study of 25 schools in a rural Maryland district, suggests that central office supervisors spend slightly more time than shown by the current survey in assisting/observing teachers (35% vs. 31%), in conducting training/workshops (9% vs. 8%), and in evaluating teachers (11% vs. 5%), and less time than shown in the survey in developing/selecting

Table 16

Practice and Preference of School-Based Supervisors' Use of Time*

Activity	Practice(N=38)			Preference (N=34)		
	#Days	%Time	Rank	#Days	%Time	Rank
Observe and assist teachers	63.32	31.66	1	87.24	43.62	1
Tasks not directly related to supervision	59.28	29.64	2	23.98	11.99	3
Other	22.04	11.02	3	8	4.00	7
Evaluate teachers	17.42	8.71	4	16.08	8.04	6
Learn	15.76	7.88	5	21.70	10.85	4
Plan/conduct staff development/inservice	15.5	7.75	6	27.02	13.51	2
Develop/review curriculum	14.66	7.33	7	21.70	9.57	5

* The majority of school-based staff are principals, also includes building-level supervisors and helping teachers.

curriculum (5% vs. 10%). The greater percentage of time spent in activities related to supervisor-teacher interaction and instructional concerns than reported in the survey might be explained by the fact that the leadership of this particular LEA makes clear its expectation that supervisors spend a significant amount of time assisting teachers, and holds then accountable for such activities.

A study (Burch and Danley, 1980) of how central office supervisors spend time found that they spend about 59% of their time in roles related to instructional improvement (i.e., information and dissemination, resource allocation, training and development, observation and evaluation, and motivation), and the remainder of their time in roles important to the functioning of schools but unrelated to instruction (i.e., ceremonial host, formal communications, external contacts, and crisis management).

Another report (Sullivan, 1982) suggests that the self-reports of time usage given in the district study and the current survey may over-estimate the actual amount of time spent in supervisor-teacher interaction. Sullivan shows, through a direct analysis of supervisory behavior, that central office supervisors spend 61% of their time engaged in formal and informal verbal interaction, mainly with their peers, and not with teachers (who accounted for only 14% of the communication). Direct technical assistance to the teachers (including classroom observation and inservice education) took even less supervisory time (7%). Ten percent of the supervisor's time was involved in travel.

A national survey of principals' use of time shows that Maryland principals report using more time in instructional leadership activities than did principals in the national group. In the national group, the non-supervisory tasks accounted for the largest portion of principals' time,

ranging from 70% of their time at the elementary level to 80% of their time at the senior high school level; most of this time was spent in the office responding to paperwork. Only 30% of principals' time at the elementary level, and 20% at the senior high school level, was spent on tasks of instructional leadership including classroom supervision, teacher evaluation, and planning. No significant amount of time was spent on staff development or selecting materials (Howell, 1981).

A 1975 report of use of time by superintendents, assistant superintendents, principals, vice principals, special supervisors, and reading specialists stated that the administrators spent their supervisory time as follows: 12% in individual observation of the teacher/classroom, 4% in individual conferences with teachers, 10% in planning with groups of teachers, and 4% in planning inservice. After a series of training workshops, these activities increased from 26% to 54% of the administrators' time (Ward, 1975).

This latter investigation confirms that staff development activities relating to technical skills and time management techniques can help increase the amount of supervisory time spent observing and assisting teachers, and decrease the amount of time given to administrative tasks.* Time management skills are viewed as desirable supervisor competencies, and various strategies are discussed in the literature to improve them (Champagne & Hogan, 1981; Sergiovanni, 1984; Sexton & Switzer, 1982; Stevens, 1984).

However, it should also be noted that even when people have good time management skills and are professional and productive, other influences affect how they use their time. One of these is personal preference. Preference

---

* Time management and related training is variously defined. Ideally, it begins with clarification of organizational priorities and purposes and individual role definition, relates to needed expertise, and also attends to the specifics of time management skills.

results in supervisors spending more time on assignments that they enjoy -- each individual emphasizing particular tasks according to his/her style or type (Mitroff, 1976). Self assessment, coupled with job analysis, can influence time and energy allocations suggested by personal preference, and such training might benefit supervisors.

A second significant influence on use of time is organizational accountability, which may include fire fighting, temporary assignments, or tasks in a "management by objectives" system. Time is spent in response to organizational accountability when a more senior person requires a supervisor to get a job done. Survey information indicates that organizational accountability does take time away from supervision in Maryland. The survey respondents (central office supervisors and school-based supervisors) addressed two related questions: (1) In the last 12 months, what two or three issues, concerns, or programs, took the most attention, time, and energy of educators in the system, and (2) In the last 12 months, did those concerns or programs interact with supervisory responsibilities (i.e., was the task made easier, more difficult)? The answers show that, in the opinion of all respondents, administrative and school/instructional improvement issues (in that order) were the focus of school systems' attention, and most respondents felt these issues and concerns made supervisory tasks much more difficult by taking time away from supervisory responsibilities.

Some examples of the administrative concerns on which supervisors reported they spent time are the budget crisis, consolidation of schools, and reduction of supervisory staff. Examples of instructional issues include Project Basic testing, use of computers, and curriculum revision.

Assistant superintendents also stated that specific assignments (mainly in the areas of administration and curriculum) took supervisors away from observing and assisting teachers. The examples given include:

- Administrative responsibilities for a subject area, general administrative responsibilities, curriculum development committees
- Too much time on refining curriculum, planning events, information gathering, and idea exchange
- As general supervisors in a small county, they are assigned many responsibilities, i.e., attending meetings, chairing advisory councils, writing curriculum, serving on negotiations team, preparing budget, etc., etc., etc.
- Curriculum development, Board reports, other reports to the Superintendent
- Supervisors have "lost time" for such activities as: 350th anniversary responsibilities, certified and non-certified negotiations, planning of summer school, etc.
- Budget preparation, equipment specifications, state meetings, legal hearings (special ed.), building committees, interview committees, etc.

These survey comments highlight the dilemma of many administrators who assign supervisors to accomplish necessary administrative and curriculum tasks, but then discover supervisors lack sufficient time for observing and assisting teachers. Senior administrators must first acknowledge this conflict, and then systematically allocate supervisory time in accordance with the district's philosophy and priorities before such conflicts of organizational accountability can be resolved.

Observation and Assistance

A major supervisory task is to gather information regarding teaching effectiveness for the purposes of administrative performance appraisal (summative evaluation) or developmental assessment (formative evaluation). The kind of information gathered and how it is used determine how well these purposes are achieved. Maryland supervisors most often gather information

through observation and by talking with teachers. They usually do not gather such information by talking with other staff, analyzing student test scores, or comparing what the teacher does with what is recommended by the effective schools research. Once information is gathered and analyzed, implications need to be explored, and strategies and new knowledge determined and applied. Strategizing and knowledge building occurs through one-on-one supervisor-teacher interaction, or staff development. If little interaction occurs after information gathering, assistance is minimal. This section reports how supervisors observe and analyze the process and content of teaching, and how they interact with teachers. It compares survey results with the observation/evaluation checklists/frameworks from the Maryland LEA and gives recommendations for the improvement of observation and assistance.

Focus on Instructional Process

When observing how teachers teach, supervisors focus on the instructional process occurring in the classroom. The models or methods used by Maryland supervisors are discussed, with reference to the literature in each case: (1) instructional variety to match learning styles, (2) checklists of local standards, (3) frameworks for direct instruction models, (4) classification systems, and (5) teacher-determined models.*

Instructional variety. Most survey respondents (mean of 3.88) claim to look at how a teacher teaches, focusing on "instructional variety accommodating students learning styles and prior learning/ability levels." (See Table 17.) The focus on learning styles is interesting, especially since experience shows that both supervisors and teachers have difficulty using research findings to match teaching and learning styles in the classroom.

---

* Summaries of the models and methods for supervision most frequently discussed are summarized in the Appendix.

Table 17

Supervisory Practice and Preference in
Looking at How a Teacher Teaches in Large, Medium, and Small LEAs

Survey Item	Practice and Preference by District Size							
	Large (N=19)		Medium (N=34)		Small (N=33)		Total (N=8)	
	Practice Means	Preference Means	Practice Means	Preference Means	Practice Means	Preference Means	Practice Means	Preference Means
Focus on:								
1. Instructional processes of a model	3.74	3.89	3.27	3.88	3.12	3.85	3.32	3.87
2. Instructional strategies of a taxonomy	3.26	3.74	2.70	3.50	2.91	3.61	2.91	3.60
3. Impact of instruction using a classification system	3.89	4.22	2.82	3.56	3.38	4.16	3.27	3.94
4. What the teacher determined in a preconference	2.50	3.50	2.59	3.72	2.57	3.70	2.56	3.66
5. Instructional variety, accommodating students' learning styles	4.21	4.74	3.79	4.33	3.79	4.61	3.88	4.53
6. A given checklist or framework	2.69	3.25	3.87	3.73	3.23	3.94	3.37	3.72

Scale ranges from 1.00 (minimal) to 5.00 (high agreement).

The literature has presented confusing information about diagnosing personality styles and preferred cognitive and affective modes. Although some supervisors and teachers are aware of this knowledge, they have difficulty in applying it in complex educational settings. What frequently happens is that supervisors intuitively judge a teaching style (e.g., lecture) to be inappropriate for a child who is not learning (e.g., a bored student or one with low verbal skill) and tell the teacher to use another activity (e.g., role-playing). The teacher, in turn, adds the new activity to his/her teaching repertoire and perhaps the student learns better. However, a variety of activities alone does not demonstrate use of the learning theory behind teaching-learning styles or create optimal learning conditions. Supervisors and teachers need to recognize the general principles of that theory. They must acknowledge their preferred modes of teaching and guard against over teaching in that mode. For example, according to the Myers-Briggs personality typology, many high school teachers (e.g., of physical sciences, physical education, home economics, business) are detail-oriented thinkers, while others (e.g., language arts, guidance counselors) are more likely to be intuitive conceptualizers. Each group needs to vary teaching activities to meet needs of students unlike themselves, and to do so purposefully. While students should have the opportunity to learn through their preferred style, they should also be challenged by less "comfortable" approaches. Research shows that it is valuable for teachers to develop specific learning activities that reinforce basic learning styles, and teachers should have materials available to support these activities (Friedman and Alley, 1984). Research on teaching-learning styles also suggests that specific instructional models, such as Active Teaching, can be successfully adapted for students with various

preferred learning styles and that teachers whose teaching styles differ from those used by the model may need extra guidance when implementing the model (Good, Grouws, & Ebmeier, 1983).

Attending to the prior learning of students seems to be an overlooked but vital aspect of classroom instruction (Bloom, 1976). If teachers provide for appropriate learning and success in the early stages of learning, then students are more likely to be successful in later stages of related learning. Supervisors and teachers can ascertain learning levels by carefully examining students' previous achievement test results (which survey results suggest supervisors do not do), responses on classroom tests, or student answers to questions on knowledge pertinent to the next lesson (Squires, Huitt, & Segars, 1983).

Simple awareness of learning theory is not enough to operationalize its implications for teaching and learning effectively. What is needed is what Joyce & Showers (1984) label executive control over this body of knowledge. Supervisors and teachers must be able to analyze the classroom situation and integrate learning theory into that context. To gain executive control over new knowledge, both supervisors and teachers need the kind of training experience that will give them practice in developing and applying that skill.

While survey respondents claim that greatest attention is paid to instructional variety to match learning styles, materials submitted do not strongly support this claim, nor do they provide evidence of attention to the concepts outlined above. Although many observational checklists contain items asking if the teacher provides for individual differences, they do not define how that might be done.

Checklists. The second highest practice rating (mean of 3.37) related to the use of traditional checklists/frameworks for observation/evaluation. Only

medium-sized districts rate checklists as the most practiced method (mean of 3.87). Overall, of the six alternatives listed, use of a checklist ranks fourth by preference. Among the materials submitted from 21 LEAs were 16 standard checklists/frameworks. Three LEAs used goal setting or performance appraisal systems. Also, two respondents used instruments based on identified instructional models: Active Teaching and Madeline Hunter's lesson framework.

Although the majority of districts are using a traditional LEA checklist/framework for observation/evaluation, the instruments vary greatly in both content and format and how they are actually used. Some have supporting materials that describe purposes and procedures; others do not. The 16 checklist/frameworks are used generally for the purpose of summative evaluation. They most often require a rating (e.g., outstanding, satisfactory, unsatisfactory) and/or a brief comment on general teacher attributes, classroom behaviors, staff relationships, or professional development. In some LEAs, the general behaviors being assessed on a checklist are described in fuller detail in supplementary materials. In a few cases, the checklist corresponds to statements or lists of the qualities and skills of effective teachers.

There are weaknesses in materials from all sizes of districts. Some checklists contain items that are so general (e.g., teacher resourcefulness, use of a variety of instructional techniques) that it is difficult to determine what a satisfactory rating on that item might mean. Approximately forty-five percent of the items on the checklists relate to personal, administrative, and curriculum concerns (e.g., appropriate dress, record keeping, professional relations) rather than instructional behaviors or classroom management. This occurs even though the purpose or goal most frequently mentioned for evaluation is instructional improvement. None of the

checklists suggests which, if any, teacher attributes or behaviors to be rated are most important for effective teaching, or how much of a behavior is required for a satisfactory rating. In general, supervisors simply record the incidence of behavior (e.g., lesson planning, attractive appearance, or higher-level questioning techniques). They do not assess how much of it is necessary for successful teaching. One of the more noticeable deficiencies in the LEA checklists is the failure of items on a observation checklist to match those on the evaluation report form. Occasionally, it is just a lack of parallel phrasing of items, but sometimes an item/category on one form is completely absent on the other.

The best checklist examples are accompanied by supporting and explanatory materials that clearly describe the purposes or goals for evaluation, procedures for observation/evaluation (who, how, when, by whom), policies for teacher redress, and remedial help that might be given to persons receiving poor ratings. They reflect well-designed systems of observation/evaluation that are based on professional knowledge. The criteria used in the assessment of teaching show familiarity with current knowledge of teaching effectiveness.

While identical observation/forms were received from respondents within an LEA in many cases, in some cases different forms or observation frameworks were used by supervisors in a given LEA. Such variety is not usually intended by senior administrators. Use of standardized observation/evaluation forms also varies in some LEA's. For example, in some districts the same form is supposed to be used by principals to gather information for administrative performance and by central office supervisors to gather information for developmental assessment. However, the supervisors may not find the form useful for their purposes and disregard it. Some principals may choose to use

evaluation checklists primarily for record-keeping rather than during observation, or they use one form for observation and another for evaluation. In general practice, forms are filled out annually by the principal, who uses information collected during the year by the various supervisors who may or may not have used the form. The form satisfies "due process," and reflects overall performance.

The literature reflects both widespread use and dissatisfaction with the traditional checklist systems used most often in the observation and evaluation of teachers. More than 65% of school districts use checklists, most often for the purpose of summative evaluation (McGreal, 1983). The major complaint about checklists is that they lack both reliability (consistency across observers/evaluators) and validity (accurateness and comprehensiveness in assessing teacher quality as defined by agreed on criteria) (McGreal 1983; Peterson & Kauchak, 1982). Teachers claim that many supervisors are incompetent observers who give subjective appraisals of their teaching; they also argue that many of the criteria used to judge their performance are not valid. Analysis of many checklists support such criticism. Criteria are often stated in the form of traits, characteristics, teaching styles, or behaviors that are locally determined to be important. Criteria often relate to administrative or personality factors rather than instructional behaviors. Frequently ratings reflect little real evidence of a connection with student learning. Checklists tend to address relatively general areas of competence which have ambiguous definitions, and this leads to subjective determinations of competence during observation. It is well-known that observers frequently differ in the ratings they assign the same teacher. Critics also feel that it

is presumptious to think that anyone can identify a finite number of criteria for effective teaching, applicable to all teachers in all situations (ERS, 1978; McGreal, 1983; Peterson & Kauchak, 1982).

The most serious deficiency of checklist systems of observation and evaluation is that they fail to achieve one of their major goals, the improvement of teaching. Collection of information and evaluation do not, by themselves, identify improvements. If improvements are to be made, information has to be analyzed, conclusions drawn, and specific strategies or activities selected and implemented. Appropriate strategizing and implementation (with administrative support) does result in improvement.

Direct instruction frameworks. In at least two districts, observation formats are used that are based on specific instructional models: Active Teaching and Madeline Hunter's Framework. These instruments differ in two important ways from the LEA checklists: (1) they contain only items related to the instructional behaviors specified by the model; and (2) those behaviors occur in a particular sequence. Observations of teaching are therefore focused to a much greater degree. This type of observation/evaluation supplies information that is useful in improving teaching and is supported by research on effective schools. However, such a method is not generic -- cannot be used for all subjects and all grade levels -- and should be used only when it is in harmony with local criteria.

Classification systems. Supervisors in large districts gave a relatively high rating (3.87) to the statement "I focus on the impact of instruction on students using a given classification system" (e.g., a time-on-task model). The assertion was not substantiated by the materials submitted, however.

Perhaps this can be explained by the fact that such models are used in a few LEAs as part of an instructional improvement process in several classrooms or schools. They do not seem to be part of the general supervisory process.

Teacher-determined models. The biggest difference in ratings between what is practiced and what is preferred is focusing on "that which the teacher determined in a pre-conference" (means of 2.56 and 3.66, respectively). suggesting some preference for this basic element of the clinical supervision or goal-setting models but little practice of it. Materials from three LEAs are goal setting or performance appraisal processes in which teachers set goals with their supervisors in a pre-conference, and are observed and evaluated on these goals. Although the goal-setting process is a significant departure from the use of a traditional checklist in supervision, in that it aids and structures formative evaluation, the forms for summative evaluation in these districts are similar to others not using the goal-setting process.

The model most frequently discussed in the literature as a strategy for developmental assessment is the clinical supervision model. This model uses a structured system for observing teachers and conferencing with them on instructional improvement. Activities are grouped into the following five steps: (1) pre-observation conference -- determining the purpose and focus of observation, (2) observation -- gathering descriptive data about classroom events, (3) analysis and strategy session -- reviewing and interpreting observation data as related to agreed on purpose, educational theory, and research, (4) post-observation conference -- giving feedback to the teacher on the observation and its analysis, and planning next steps, and (5) critique - jointly analyzing the usefulness of the cycle's activities. Emphasis is

placed on the collegial relationship of the supervisor and teacher as they work together through the steps of the model, and on the descriptive and non-evaluative nature of observation.

In practice, clinical supervision appears to be fully implemented only rarely, and some of the implementation appears to follow the "form" but not the "spirit" of the model. In other words, in some instances clinical supervision is being used as what Snyder (1981) calls an "inspection system" or means for teacher evaluation and not teacher improvement. In these cases, the "tool skills" of the model are being used to monitor and evaluate teachers. Another, more positive, adaptation of the model seen in practice is the incorporation of the spirit of colleagueship into supervision but not the step-by-step methodology (McFaul & Cooper, 1984; Garman, 1982). It is likely that the requirements of the model, especially the time commitments necessary for success and the collegial interaction of teacher and supervisor, make it difficult to implement in some settings, especially some urban schools. Perhaps in these situations environmental changes need to occur before the model can succeed (McFaul & Cooper, 1984). Goldsberry (1984) stresses the importance of aligning the supervisory approach with other organizational interventions, such as staff and curriculum development and teacher evaluation.

Overall, it appears that no single theoretical model meets local needs and no local model meets the stated LEA goal of improvement of practice. So much attention is paid to "means" that little is given to "ends." There are various resources in use in the state, but few instances in which they are used to their greatest degree of effectiveness. Yet, in some cases appropriate materials have been developed and observation procedures negotiated. The hard work of development has been done, and what is needed is application for assistance and improvement.

Focus On Instructional Content

When observing what teachers teach, supervisors focus on the content of instruction: the curriculum being taught by the teacher. The survey shows that supervisors gather information about the curriculum most often by looking at "the match with the district core curriculum" (mean of 4.35) or "the match with given curriculum objectives" (4.34). (See Table 18.) Evaluation/ observation materials seem to document this; 17 of the 21 observation checklist/frameworks submitted mentioned objectives, goals, or purposes of the curriculum.

The highest preference ratings were given to the same two items as the highest practice ratings: "the match with the district core curriculum" (4.55) and "the match with given curriculum objectives" (4.67). The item with the greatest difference between practice and preference is "the match with objectives and activities specified by the teacher in a preconference" (means of 2.96 and 3.92), suggesting limited attention to preconferencing and a preference for this concept (which is related to the clinical supervision or goal-setting models).

Responses are generally similar across districts regardless of size. One exception is the significant difference in reported practice for "engage in pre- and post-conferences about observed lessons" in large and medium sized districts. (The mean score for large districts is 4.26, while for medium sized districts the mean score is 2.97, suggesting preconferencing is occurring in a significant number of the larger LEAs but in few of the medium sized LEAs.) An analysis of the observation/ evaluation materials submitted shows that three large Maryland districts use the concept of setting performance goals for content before summative evaluation.

Table 18

Ratings of Supervisory Practice and Preference in
Looking at What a Teacher Teaches in
Large, Medium, and Small LEAs

Survey Item	Practice and Preference by District Size							
	Large (N=19)		Medium (N=32)		Small (N=33)		Total (N=84)	
	Practice Means	Preference Means	Practice Means	Preference Means	Practice Means	Preference Means	Practice Means	Preference Means
Focus on:								
1. Match with core curriculum	4.79	4.89	4.22	4.39	4.21	4.52	4.35	4.55
2. Match with approved texts	2.94	3.35	2.19	2.45	3.19	3.56	2.75	3.10
3. Match with given curriculum objectives	4.79	4.89	4.21	4.53	4.21	4.67	4.34	4.67
4. Match with objectives and activities specified in preconference	3.79	4.42	2.56	3.69	2.87	3.84	2.96	2.92

Scale ranges from 1.00 (minimal) to 5.00 (high agreement).

Given the Project Basic curriculum match mandate, the number of LEAs having centralized core curricula, and the research on curriculum alignment (Brady et al., 1977; Niedermeyer, 1977), it is not surprising that supervisors focus on this area. Preconferencing is not necessarily an alternative, but can be a useful clarification process. What is not determined by the survey or supporting materials is exactly how supervisors make judgments on effective alignment of objectives, instructional activities, and assessment. Checklists do not include items related to this area.

Experts caution that efforts to improve curriculum alignment require careful consideration of what is most important in a curriculum because of the competing number of topics that could be taught. This process is likely to be time consuming and involve conflict (Squires, Huitt, Segars, 1983). Since all Maryland LEAs matched objectives (and state-wide tests) to curriculum for Project Basic, local experience is probably ahead of the literature in this area (especially since Project Basic facilitators used relevant research to inform their efforts). However, not all supervisors were involved in that process, and some could possibly benefit from professional development activities to gain executive control over knowledge and skills relating to curriculum alignment, and the relative importance of content addressed by teachers being supervised.

Supervisor-Teacher Interactions

In the process of gathering information about a teacher's performance (mainly through observation), supervisors engage in a set of interactions with teachers during which they communicate their personal perspectives about observation/evaluation, and gather and analyze feedback data about teaching

(see Table 19). The nature of these interactions helps to determine whether or not supervisors effectively achieve goals related to administrative appraisal or developmental assessment (and/or assistance).

The survey shows that, in practice, supervisors communicate their personal perspectives about observation/evaluation most often by showing they are "responsive to teachers' concerns, by building trust" (mean of 4.40). Given a preference, they would do the same.

The interaction supervisors most frequently engage in is to acknowledge teacher efforts and success (4.66). Fairly often, they also make recommendations for improvement (4.53), and review conclusions (successes and shortcomings) (4.48).

The highest preference ratings for these interactions are "acknowledge efforts and successes" (4.90), "review conclusions (successes and shortcomings) after a lesson" (4.81), and "am responsive to teachers' concerns, build trust" (4.81). The lowest rated item is: "review teacher's activities in and out of the classroom" (3.89). Once again, the largest discrepancy in ratings between practice and preference (occurs on the item related to the clinical supervision and goalsetting models, "engage in pre- and post-conferences about observed lesson(s)" (means of 3.46 and 4.34, respectively).

Reports of supervisory interactions are fairly consistent across respondent role groups, with assistant superintendents reporting a somewhat lower perception of "practice" on all items.

Although the types of teacher interactions which appear to occur frequently certainly are essential to good supervision, it is also interesting to note what supervisors do not do. They are not engaging in pre- and post-conferences, nor are they exploring the teachers' feelings or ideas; two elements which are central to the concept of developmental assessment in the

Table 19

Ratings of Practice and Preference in Supervisor-Teacher Interactions

Survey Item	Rating	
	Practice (N=85) Mean	Preference (N=85) Mean
Personal Perspective		
Engage in open discussion; reach a common understanding	4.13	4.70
Am responsive to teacher's concerns, build trust	4.40	4.81
Explore teacher's feelings, ideas	4.01	4.54
Data Gathering/Analysis Activities		
Engage in pre- and post-conferences about observed lesson(s)	3.46	4.34
Objectively describe events observed in classroom	4.34	4.61
Review conclusions (successes/ short-comings)	4.48	4.81
Make recommendations for improvement	4.53	4.80
Acknowledge efforts and successes	4.66	4.90
Review teacher's activities in and out of the classroom	3.34	3.89

clinical or goal-setting models (Squires, 1978). Supervisors also are not reviewing teachers' activities in and out of the classroom. In other words, supervisors are not discussing teachers' contributions to the school as a whole in curriculum planning or school leadership, a concept appropriate to comprehensive administrative assessment.

Improving Assistance

It is apparent that many Maryland LEAs could benefit from choosing a model of supervision that: (1) more effectively and efficiently employs available staff in activities that help teachers improve student instruction, and (2) more closely aligns supervisory activities with organizational goals.

A process of integrated supervision might be developed in which the following objectives are achieved.

- Cross-hierarchical decision-making occurs to define the philosophy and purpose of supervision and its relationship to evaluation. Subsequently, strategic planning takes place to design appropriate organizational arrangements and technical processes (Ackoff, 1977).

- Evaluation for personnel decision-making (accountability) is separated in time and purpose from supervision (see Table 20 for examples) (Knapp, 1983; McGreal, 1982; Oliva, 1984; Stiggins & Bridgeford, 1984).

- Supervision consists of the systematic provision of information, training, and assistance to aid teachers in making improvements in delivery of instruction, as identified by individual assessment and/or organizational needs.

- Identification of improvement opportunities (and the extent to which teachers effectively apply recommendations) occurs in part through classroom observation. Such observation is separate in time and purpose from observation conducted for evaluation, but both should be based on guidelines or standards that reflect general criteria of effective teaching. Observation is purposeful, focusing on observable behaviors, not personal conclusions (Evertson & Holley, 1981; Soar, et al., 1983).

- Information collected during developmental assessment influences the design of staff and curriculum development activities for groups of teachers who have common improvement needs. It also contributes to information used in determining improvement activities, designed to meet needs as perceived by individuals (Cawelti & Reavis, 1980).

Table 20

A Comparison of Two Purposes for Teacher Observation/Evaluation

Purpose	Staff Responsibility	Supervisor-Teacher Relationship	Process	Data Collection
Administrative Performance Appraisal -- to sample a teacher's overall performance, to measure competence for administrative decision-making, e.g., retention, dismissal, tenure, promotion	Principal (may have input of supervisors)	Superior-subordinate	Formal procedures with legal standing (due process) Use of standardized evaluation criteria Annual or biannual observation Global focus on wide variety of technical behavior May include evaluation of non-classroom activities	Teacher observation using standardized criteria and methods and measures Review of teaching materials Ongoing monitoring of all teacher activities
Developmental Assessment -- to improve instructional delivery by diagnosing opportunities for teacher improvement leading to continuous professional development for all staff	Central office supervisors, helping teachers, department heads, principals (in some schools)	Collegial	Context specific procedures Use of diagnostic criteria Frequent observation (sometimes at teacher's request) Focus on specific teaching behavior often mutually determined as an area that could be improved	Teacher observation using context specific criteria Use of multiple data sources for information on teaching behavior e.g., peer evaluation, self-evaluation, student evaluation, analysis of teaching materials

- Responsibility for developmental assessment and assistance is shared among central office supervisors, principals, and experienced teachers (e.g., vice principals, resource teachers, and department heads). The three role groups are required to coordinate activities, with the principal assuming primary responsibility for evaluation, the department head assuming primary responsibility for individual on-site coaching (operational level activities), and the central office supervisor assuming primary responsibility for system-wide or cross-school activities. The teacher hears one message of evaluation, one message of improvement, and the two are related. In small systems, if one person is solely responsible for evaluation and assistance, purposes must remain separate (Hawley, 1982; Oliva, 1984), with the supervisor being careful to clarify his/her role when interacting with teachers.

While all Maryland LEAs have one or more elements of an effective supervisory system in place, all have room for improvement. Needs differ, but the greatest common needs are for supervisors to coordinate activities, focus on priorities, and pay much greater attention to strategizing and knowledge building for improvement. In much of the supervision literature and in district practice, the overwhelming concern has been how to design and implement effective developmental assessment (Lewis, 1982). This concern, reflecting a desire to make cost-effective data-based decisions, is admirable but incomplete: once the methods and measures of assessment are developed and implemented, improvement strategies must be identified and applied. Without the latter, the former are not of much use to teachers. Many Maryland LEAs may choose to modify their methods and measures of assessment, and most probably need to improve their assistance capability.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In order to inform state and local administrators and supervisors in Maryland, data were collected (by survey questionnaire, document analysis, and informal interviews), and the professional literature was reviewed to determine supervisory practices and preferences in the state in relation to general national research and practice. Some key findings and issues were identified.

- While everyone would prefer to share a common philosophy of supervision as an improvement process, in practice assistant superintendents believe that "supervision and evaluation are linked by common criteria but separated in time and purpose;" central office supervisors believe that "supervision and evaluation of teachers are essentially the same thing;" and school-based supervisors believe that "supervision is primarily an accountability process." Within school systems, there is rarely a common understanding among role groups of the purpose, philosophy, and process of supervision.

- Supervisory responsibilities are undertaken by central office supervisors and specialists, principals and vice principals, department heads and team leaders, curriculum coordinators, and resource teachers. Only central office staff, principals, and vice-principals are considered to be administrators, and only they can influence teachers' annual performance reviews (evaluation). Usually, principals have primary responsibility for evaluation, but in several LEAs more than one role group "claims" primary responsibility.

- On average, each central office supervisor supervises 94 teachers in seven schools, spending about 63 days a year in classroom observation and direct assistance.

- Job descriptions for supervisors often indicate general responsibilities in the areas of curriculum development, staff development, teacher supervision, and administration. However, they do not systematically clarify such responsibilities by suggesting linkages between areas, prioritizing duties, or stating measures of job effectiveness.

- Of five general areas related to supervisory responsibility, the most practiced activity is "monitor teachers' progress, paying greater attention to those who are less effective or new." The least practiced activity is "systematically discuss needs and opportunities with the appropriate principal, contributing to teachers' annual evaluations."

- Although many supervisors feel their supervisory responsibilities (as "understood" or stated in a job description) are compatible with their accountabilities (what their immediate supervisor expects), some voice frustration over a discrepancy between the two.

- Most supervisors view their responsibilities within a context of a summative supervision/evaluation, and there is little evidence that incumbents are successful in creating "double-win" strategies that link tasks of direct supervision with tasks of curriculum or program development, or administration.

- On average, elementary principals supervise 20 teachers, and secondary principals supervise 62 teachers, spending about 60 days a year in classroom observation and direct assistance.

- Others involved in supervision supervise about 38 teachers if based in a single school, or 103 teachers if working across several schools.

- The larger the district, the more teachers supervised by any supervisor. In small and large districts, teachers are supervised by more individuals than in medium sized districts. On average, a teacher is supervised by two or three people, each of whom may have different priorities.

- Central office supervisors spend their time as follows: in observing and assisting teachers (30.67%); attending meetings (10.27%); writing proposals, plans, reports, and record keeping (8.25%); planning/conducting staff development/inservice (7.53%); and evaluating teachers, (5.40%). School-based supervisors (mainly principals) spend 29.65% on tasks not related to the supervision of teachers, and 31.66% of their time observing/assisting teachers.

- Supervisors reported that administrative and instructional improvement issues took time away from supervision. Since instructional improvement is, theoretically, the desired outcome of supervision, this complaint is a concern related to the understanding of supervision and to the LEA mission of schooling.

- In observing the instructional process, supervisors say they focus on instructional variety in accommodating students' learning styles and prior learning/ability levels. This is a concern because supervisors and teachers have difficulty in interpreting the research related to these concepts, and many observation/evaluation materials from the LEAs do not support such a statement.

- Supervisors give the second highest rating to focusing on a given checklist or framework. The materials submitted from LEAs support this.

- Overall, it appears that no single theoretical model for looking at instructional process meets local needs and no local model meets the LEA goal of improvement of practice. More attention is paid to the "means" of data collection than the "end" of instructional improvement.

- In supervisor-teacher interactions, supervisors show they are "responsive to teachers' concerns," and they "acknowledge teacher efforts and successes."

- When focusing on instructional content, supervisors most often look at "the match with district core curriculum" or "the match with curriculum objectives," which is not surprising given the Project Basic curriculum match mandate.

- In summary, supervisors prefer to be independent, do not like using test data in decision-making, and want to develop greater expertise in using relevant research.

In locally developed materials and survey responses, there was evidence of a wide range of perspectives, expertise, and approaches. While diversity might well be appropriate (given relative district size and existing organizational priorities), there should be cohesion within an LEA, and much stronger evidence of activity to address the preferred goal (stated by survey respondents) that supervision should result in the improvement of practice. That goal is not impossible to achieve, and support may be provided by materials such as this paper, by policy analysis such as the work of the State Task Force on Teacher Quality, and by activities such as the various conferences and workshops sponsored by state and local leaders. Ultimately, local educators have responsibility for decisions and actions to influence and improve practice and preference in supervision.

If it is assumed that changes can and should be made to improve the organization and delivery of supervision, each LEA may benefit from applying a process of interactive strategic planning, improving coordination, reducing organizational complexity by clarifying roles and responsibilities, and focusing to a much greater extent on the improvement phase of the supervision cycle.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ackoff, R.L. The corporate raindance. The Wharton Magazine, Winter 1977, 36-41.

Alfonso, R.J. & Goldsberry, L. Colleagueship in supervision. In T.J. Sergiovanni, (Ed.) Supervision of teaching. Alexandria, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1982.

Bloom, B.S. Human characteristics and school learning. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1976.

Blumberg, A. Central office supervisors: A brief study conducted by the ASCD committee on research on central office supervision. Unpublished paper, 1984.

Borich, G.D. The appraisal of teaching: Concept and process. Boston: Addison-Wesley, 1977.

Brady, M.E., Clinton, C., Sweeney, J.N., Peterson, M., & Poyner, H. Instructional dimensions study. Washington, D.C.: Kirschner Associates, Inc., 1977.

Burch, B.G., & Danley, W.E., Sr. The instructional leadership role of central office supervisors. Educational Leadership, 1980, 37(8), 636-637. Also in E.E. Grimsley, & R.E. Bruce (Eds.), Readings in educational supervision. Arlington, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1982.

Cawelti, G., & Reavis, C. How well are we providing instructional improvement services? Education Leadership, 1980, 38(3), 236-240. Also in E.E. Grimsley, & R.E. Bruce (Eds.), Readings in educational supervision. Arlington, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum, 1982.

Champagne, D., & Hogan, R.C. Consultant supervision: Theory and skill development. Wheaton, Ill.: C.H. Publications, 1981.

Cooley, W. & Leinhardt, G. The instructional dimensions study. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 1980, 2, 7-25.

Darling-Hammond, L., Wise, A.E., & Pease, S.R. Teacher evaluation in the organizational context: A review of the literature. Review of Educational Research, 1983, 53(3), 285-328.

Educational Research Services (ERS). Evaluating teacher performance. Arlington, Va.: author, 1978.

Eisner, E.W. An artistic approach to supervision. In T.J. Sergiovanni (Ed.), Supervision of teaching. Alexandria, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1982.

Ellett, C.D., Capie, W., & Johnson, C.E. Assessing teaching performance. Educational Leadership, 1980, 38(3), 219-220.

Evertson, E.M., & Holley, F.M. Classroom observation. In J. Millman (Ed.), Teacher evaluation. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage, 1981.

Firth, G.R., & Eiken, K.P. Impact of the school's bureaucratic structure on supervision. In T.J. Sergiovanni (Ed.), Supervision of teaching. Arlington, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1982.

Friedman, P., & Alley, R. Learning/teaching styles: Applying the principles. Theory into Practice. 1984, 23(1), 77-81.

Garman, N.B. The clinical approach to supervision. In T.J. Sergiovanni (Ed.), Supervision of teaching. Alexandria, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1982.

Glatthorn, A.A. Differentiated supervision. Alexandria, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1984.

Glickman, C.D. Developmental supervision: Alternative practices for helping teachers improve instruction. Alexandria, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1981.

Goldhammer, R., Anderson, R.H., & Krajewski, R.J. (2nd ed.). Clinical supervision: Special methods for the supervision of teachers. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1980.

Goldsberry, L.F. The realities of clinical supervision: Polaroid snapshot or star wars movie? Educational Leadership, 1984, 41(7), 12-15.

Good, T.L., Grouws, D.A., Ebmeier, H. Active mathematics teaching. New York: Longman, 1983.

Grimsley, E.E., & Bruce, R.E. (Eds). Readings in educational supervision. Arlington, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1982.

Hawley, R.D. Assessing teacher performance. Amherst, Mass.: Education Research Associates, 1982.

Howell, B. Profile of the principalship. Educational Leadership, 1981, 38(4), 333-337.

Iwanicki, E.F. Contract plans. In J. Millman (Ed.), Handbook of teacher evaluation. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage, 1981.

Joyce, B.R. & Showers, B. Power in staff development through research on training. Alexandria, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1984.

Knapp, M.S. Teacher evaluation practices within schools. CEDAR Quarterly, 1982, 15(4), 3-6.

Lewis, A.C. Evaluating educational personnel. Arlington, Va.: American Association of School Administrators, 1982.

Manatt, R.P., Palmer, K.L., & Hidlebaugh, E. Evaluating teacher performance with improved rating scales. NASSP Bulletin, 1974, 60(401), 21-23.

McFaul, S.A., & Cooper, J.M. Peer clinical supervision, Educational Leadership, 1984, 41(7), 4-9.

McGreal, T.L. Effective teacher evaluation systems. Educational Leadership, 1982, 39(4), 303-305. Also in E.E. Grimsley, & R.E. Bruce (Eds.), Readings in educational supervision. Arlington, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1982.

McGreal, T.L. Successful teacher evaluation. Alexandria, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1983.

McNeil, J.D. A scientific approach to supervision. In T.J. Sergiovanni (Ed.), Supervision of teaching. Alexandria, Va.: Association for Super vision and Curriculum Development, 1982.

Millman, J. Student achievement as a measure of teacher competence. In J. Millman (Ed.), Handbook of teacher evaluation. Beverly Hills, Calif: Sage., 1981.

Mitroff, D.D. The on-site implementer of educational innovations: An examination of the interaction between the role and personality of the incumbents. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, Canada, 1976.

Niedermeyer, F.C. The testing of a prototype system for outcomes-based instructional supervision. Educational Administration, 1977, 13(2), 34-50.

Oliva, P.F. Supervision for today's schools. (2nd.ed). New York: Longman, 1984.

Peterson, K., & Kauchak, D. Teacher evaluation: Perspectives, practices and promises. Salt Lake City, Utah: Center for Educational Practice, Utah University, 1982. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 233996)

Redfern, C.B. Evaluating teachers and administrators: A performance objec tives approach. Boulder, Colo: Westview Press, 1980.

Roberts, J.M.E., Friedman, C., & Maguire. L. Wicomico County Board of Educa tion: Administrative study. Philadelphia, Pa.: Research for Better Schools, 1982.

Roberts, J.M.E., & Kenney, J.L. Institutionalization of statewide instruc tional improvement. Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools, 1984.

Russell, D., & Hunter, M. Planning for effective instruction Los Angeles: University Elementary School, 1980.

Saif, P.S. A handbook for the evaluation of classroom teachers and school principals. Bloomfield, Conn.: Capitol Region Education Council, 1976.

Sergiovanni, T.J. Handbook for effective department leadership: Concepts and practices in today's secondary schools. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1984.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (Ed.) Supervision of teaching. Alexandria, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1982.

Sexton, M.J., & Switzer, K.D.D. 1982. The time management ladder Educa tional Leadership, 1978, 35(6), 482-486. Also in E.E. Grimsley, & R.E. Bruce (Eds.), Readings in educational supervision. Arlington, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1982.

Snyder, K.J. Clinical supervision in the 1980's. Educational Leadership, 1981, 38(7), 521-524. Also in E.E. Grimsley, & R.E. Bruce (Eds), Readings in educational supervision. Arlington, Va.: Association for Supervision and curriculum Development, 1982.

Soar, R.S., Medley, D.M., & Coker, H. Teacher evaluation: A critique of currently used methods. Phi Delta Kappan, 1983, 65(4), 239-246.

Squires, D.A. A phenomenological study of supervisors' perceptions of a positive supervisory experience. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1978.

Squires, D.A., Huitt, W.G., & Segars, J.K. Effective schools and classrooms: A research-based perspective. Alexandria, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1983.

Stevens, L.J. Administrative techniques: The principal's time. NASSP Bulletin, 1984, 68(468), 59-63.

Stiggins, R.J., & Bridgeford, N.J. Performance assessment for teacher development. Portland, Ore.: Northwest Regional Laboratory, 1984. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 242 717)

Sullivan, G.G. Supervisory expectations and work realities: The great gulf. Educational Leadership, 1982, 39(4), 448-451. Also in E.E. Grimsley, & R.E. Bruce (Eds.), Readings in educational supervision. Arlington, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1982.

Ward, W.P. Max: II practicum report: The development of a training program to improve the supervisory competence of Newington public school adminis trators. Unpublished paper, 1975. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 119 387)

Wise, A.E., Darling-Hammond, L., McLaughlin, M.W., & Berstein, H.T. Teacher evaluation: A study of effective practices. Santa Monica, Calif.: Rand Corp., 1984.

APPENDICES

Summary of Models of Supervision Study

		Page
A.	Administrative Assessment Model	78
B.	Clinical Supervision	79
C.	Goal-Setting Model	80
D.	Peer Supervision/Collegial Supervision/Cooperative Professional Development	81
E.	Scientific Approach or Effective School Supervision	82
F.	Artistic/Naturalistic Approach	83
G.	Developmental Supervision	84
H.	Differentiated Supervision	85
I.	Product/Accountability Model	86
J.	Georgia Teacher Assessment Model	87

Administrative Assessment Model

Description/Major Characteristics	Strengths	Weaknesses
Traditional checklist/frameworks for administrative performance appraisal that rely on standardized criteria. Major characteristics are: • high supervisor-low teacher involvement • evaluation viewed synonomous with observation • similar procedures for tenured and nontenured teachers • major emphasis on summative evaluation • existence of standardized criteria stated in form of traits, characteristics, styles, or behaviors • instrumentation formats force comparative judgments to be made between and among people.	• can be used in situations of high teacher-supervisor ratios • allows districts to meet accountability demands while minimizing the disruptive influence of evaluation • checklists can direct attention to specific aspects of teaching/learning deemed important by LEA • gives a degree of objectivity to observations • provides a permanent record that is quick and easy to make • can help a teacher analyze his/her own behavior and determine what the supervisor considers important.	• reinforces traditional negative concepts of summative evaluation • promotes low-teacher involvement and minimizes contact time between supervisors and teachers • emphasizes standarized criteria which blocks cooperative activities between teachers and supervisors • often emphasizes administrative rather than teaching criteria; sometimes deals with superficial detail • the numerous items on checklists vary in significance, usually no attempt to weigh their importance • observers using checklists only to indicate whether or not an attribute exists not the degree of it • when use of checklists is routine, supervisors may make judgement without careful reflection and analysis.

References: ERS (1978); McGreal (1983), Peterson and Kauchak (1982)

Clinical Supervision

Description/Major Characteristics	Strengths	Weaknesses
A model that uses a systematic observation intensive collegial process to improve instruction by carrying out the following steps: • pre-observation conference -- determining the purpose of observation • observation -- gathering descriptive data about classroom events • analysis and strategy session -- reviewing and interpreting observation data as they relate to agreed on purpose, educational theory and research • post-observation conference -- giving feedback to the teacher on the observation, planning next steps • critique -- jointly analyzing the usefulness of the cycles activities. This supervisory cycle is repeated several times throughout the year as part of a plan for continuous professional development.	• recognizes individual needs of teachers • allows teachers to set professional development goals in a collegial manner with supervisor • reflects a democratic human resources perspective of supervision by incorporating concepts of collegiality, collaboration, skilled service, and ethical conduct • uses a specific cycle of steps in its methodology which results in a concrete strategy for collecting data on classroom events • involves teachers in a process that enables them to gain awareness of their classroom behavior: assumes that teachers can analyze and interpret behavior and can act in a self-directed and constructive way • mutual growth occurs for both teacher and supervisor via their interactions.	• research does not conclude that clinical supervision leads to better teaching or student achievement • requires extensive training • not all supervisors adapt well to a collegial relationship • requires up to ten hours of supervisory time per cycle • not all teachers need or respond well to clinical supervision • many of the conditions which must be present or clinical supervision are prohibited by the current realities of teacher evaluation • requires high level of teacher motivation • requires high commitment and leadership from principal who models collegiality • may require major organizational changes before it can be successful.

References: Garman (1982); Glatthorn (1984); Goldhammer, Anderson, Krajewski (1980); Goldsberry (1984); McGreal (1983); Squires, Huitt, Segars, 1983

Goal-Setting Model

Description/Major Characteristics	Strengths	Weaknesses
A system in which teachers set individual performance goals and criteria for evaluation. It is based on the following assumptions: • supervision/evaluation should focus on continual growth and improvement, not finding incompetent teachers • priorities must be set so that supervisors and teachers can focus on what is most important • supervisors should be actively involved in helping teachers reach goals • the different priority of responsibilities of the supervisor/organization and teacher must be clarified and brought closer together • continuous dialogue between supervisor and teacher concerning agreed upon priorities increase school efficiency and the emotional well-being of the teacher. Most goal-setting procedures include three steps: (1) setting goals in terms of expected results, (2) working toward those goals, and (3) reviewing progress toward the goals.	• promotes professional growth by enhancing strengths and correcting weaknesses • fosters a positive relationship between teacher and supervisor • focuses on individual needs • clarifies performance expectations and sets explicit criteria for evaluation • integrates individual and organizational goals • helps teachers realize his/her responsibility for professional development	• cannot be used to rank teachers • produces meaningless or inappropriate goals • requires too much time, inservice training, and paperwork • forces supervisors to make decisions about teacher performance in areas which they are not qualified • goals may require a relatively long time to achieve; long time spans are not suitable for effective feedback.

References: ERS (1978); Iwanicki (1981); Manatt (1976); McGreal (1983); Redfern, (1980)

Peer Supervision/Collegial Supervision/Cooperative Professional Development

Description/Major Characteristics	Strengths	Weaknesses
An approach using a structured, formalized system of peer purpose of instructional improvement. Usually this strategy involves teachers observing each other's classes, giving each other feedback, and discussing shared professional concerns. It has been implemented in several forms with peers acting as: • informal observers and consultants • clinical supervisors • focused observers • inservice directors • team teachers and observers Generally, four characteristics are present: (1) moderately formalized process, (2) involves observation and feedback, (3) is based on a collegial relationship, and (4) maintains a non-evaluative emphasis.	• harnesses the ability of teachers to contribute to instructional improvement • legitimizes the tendency for teachers to turn to colleagues rather than supervisors for advice • taps the ability of teachers to provide useful feedback to peers without extensive training • sustains norms of collegiality, a feature of effective schools • produces a sense of achievement for participating teachers that is associated with increased job satisfaction; functions as an intrinsic reward	• untrained teachers cannot provide the same quality as trained supervisors • the cost-effectiveness is questioned if substitutes have to be provided • success of strategy is questionable because observation and feedback occur as random events not linked to system goals • bureaucratic structure presents barriers to success of such a strategy • the prevailing milieu of the school argues against it: schools make teachers independent not team oriented; competitive not cooperative; and isolated, not interacting • collective bargaining agreements often interfere with successful implementation • peer evaluation has not been successful in practice

References: Alfonso & Goldsberry (1982); Glatthorn (1984)

Scientific Approach or Effective Schools Supervision

Description/Major Characteristics	Strengths	Weaknesses
A model of supervision/evaluation based on the findings of behavioral research and the product-process studies of such researchers as Rosenshine, Berliner, Brophy and Evertson, and Bloom. Supervisors help teachers to use specific teaching methods such as direct instruction or mastery learning which this research suggests are most effective. Supervisors and teachers carry out action research on specific variables (e.g., time on task, success rate, so that they can alter classroom conditions to maximize student learning).	• clarifies understanding of the components of effective teaching • focuses on well-defined instructional behaviors and models • uses action research to supply data for instructional decisions • focuses attention on a limited number of behaviors • encourages data-based decision-making • gives weight/authority to good teaching practices.	• difficult to agree on criterion of effective teaching • often presents one model of teaching as the "only" model • difficult to implement implications of research into unique classroom situations • narrow definitions of student achievement controversial -- usually low-level reasoning such as recall on comprehension not higher level reasoning such as application • attention limited to only a few variables not the whole domain of teaching-learning • supervisors/teachers often do not agree that any findings sufficiently well-established to serve as the final authority • many scientific findings about teaching effectiveness are contradictory • requires a new knowledge base for many supervisors

References: McNeil (1982); Russell & Hunter (1980); Squires, Huitt, Segars (1983)

Artistic/Naturalistic Approach

Description/Major Characteristics	Strengths	Weaknesses
A model of observation and interpretation of classroom events that disputes the existence of a scientific technology for teaching. Instead it claims teaching is an art, that has a performance quality that is characterized by both skill and grace. Or, in other works, effective teaching is similar to an aesthetic experience. The model recognizes several kinds of objectives/outcomes (both planned and unplanned). Evaluation practices depend on observation of events and the reporting of them; the emphasis is on interpreting the meaning of the classroom rather than changing teacher behavior. Characteristics include: • attention to the muted or expressive character of events, not just their incidence or literal meaning • requires high level of "educational connoisseurship," the ability to see what is significant, yet subtle • appreciates both the unique and common contributions of a teacher • requires the ability to interpret the meaning of events occuring to those who experience them and to be able to appreciate their educational significance • accepts the fact that the individual supervisor with his/her strengths, sensitivities, and experience is the major "instrument" through which an educational events is perceived and its meaning given • requires attention to the processes of the classroom over extended periods of time so that the significance of events can be placed in a temporal context • requires teacher-supervisor rapport so that dialogue and trust can be developed • requires an ability to use language in a way that uses its potential to publicize the expressive character of what has been seen.	• gives a complete view of of teaching by mapping out all that occurs in teaching; records the process of teaching not just behavior • focuses on a variety of outcomes (both anticipated and unanticipated) that contribute greater knowledge about the teaching process than other models • develops supervisor-teacher rapport • treats teachers as individuals.	• supervision/evaluation too subjective -- lacks precision • dependent on high-level verbal/analytic skills which few supervisors have • requires extensive training • requires 15-20 hours of classroom observation over several months • is a theoretical model, has not been fully implemented.

References: Eisner (1982); McGreal (1983)

Developmental Supervision

Description/Major Characteristics	Strengths	Weaknesses
A model which matches supervisory behavior to the developmental level of the teacher. Uses a continum of supervisory behavior with three major orientations of behavior: directive, collaborative, and non-directive. Each orientation includes specific major supervisory behaviors. Two criteria are used to measure teacher development: level of teacher commitment to the job and level of abstract thinking about problems. A four-part paradigm pairs level of commitment to levels of abstract thinking; each is then matched with the appropriate supervisory behavior orientation: 1. Teacher dropouts: low commitment-low abstraction. Directive supervision 2. Unfocused workers: high commitment-low abstraction. Collaborative supervision. 3. Analytic Observers: low commitment-high abstraction. Collaborative supervision. 4. Professionals: high commitment-high abstraction. Non-directive supervision. Most teachers fall into #2 and #3, therefore, collaborative supervision will be used most frequently. The goal of supervision should be to help teachers reach a higher developmental stage.	• responds to individual needs for supervision • specifies supervisory behaviors to be used with teacher • based on philosophy that teachers grow and learn, can move to greater independence	• requires a negative labeling of some teachers (at least in the supervisor's mind) • requires a careful and time-consuming assessment of each teacher's developmental level • teachers developmental stages may be difficult to determine, or may be different depending upon a given situation • teachers may be difficult to categorize according to the paradigm presented • has a rather narrow conception of teacher development: levels of commitment and abstract thinking.

Reference: Glickman (1981)

Differentiated Supervision

Description/Major Characteristics	Strengths	Weaknesses
A model based on the assumptions that all teachers have different professional growth needs and learning styles and that it is not possible (or necessary) for a system to provide clinical supervision to all teachers. This model lets a teacher choose among four supervisory options (with principal approval): 1. Clinical supervision -- an intensive process designed to improve instruction by conferring with a teaching on lesson planning, observing the lesson, analyzing observational data, and giving the teacher feedback about the observation. 2. Cooperative professional development -- collegial process in which a small group of teachers agree to work together for their growth. 3. Self development -- allows the teacher to work independently on professional growth. 4. Administrative monitoring -- administrator monitors staff by making brief and unannounced visits to insure that staff are carrying out assignments and responsibilities.	• allows teacher choice • recognizes individual teacher needs and learning style • allows supervisor to direct efforts where most needed (or wanted) • research shows model has positive effect on school climate	• requires active administrative leadership • requires supervisors to be knowledgeable about four varieties of supervision • cooperative professional development and self-development depend on a high-level of teacher initiative which may be burdensom to teachers • no real research proves that it improves teaching

Reference: Glatthorn (1984)

Product/Accountability Model

Description/Major Characteristics	Strengths	Weaknesses
A model which uses student achievement, as measured by norm- or criterion-referenced tests, to judge teacher competence. Is often linked to a CBE approach to instruction.	• Emphasis is on outcomes rather than on teaching method, style, or processes which are difficult to evaluate • student performance models are objective whereas others are "subjective" • student performance data is an invaluable aid to instructional decision-making.	• difficulty in developing criterion-referenced measurement of student growth • does not allow for confounding influences and student growth such as prior achievement or SES • measurement-statistical problems in calculating gain scores • is most often used for summative evaluation rather than formative evaluation/ supervision • often viewed negatively by teachers.

References: Borich (1977); McGreal (1983); Milliman (1981)

Georgia Teacher Assessment Model

Description/Major Characteristics	Strengths	Weaknesses
An example of a competency-based teacher assessment program. A systematic assessment of teacher performance based on a field-tested instrument, The Teacher Performance Assessment Instrument (TPAI). The instrument measures 14 teaching competencies related to classroom procedures, interpersonal skills, and teacher developed materials through observation, review of materials, and interview. Each teacher is assessed by a principal, a person from outside the school, and another teacher. Feedback from the assessment is given to the teacher for the purpose of improvement.	• criteria have been agreed on as indicators of competence by educators • provides a conceptual framework of teaching useful for analyzing and monitoring performance • provides an objective system for evaluating teaching • uses well-trained observers • extensive planning of system and development of instruments	• teaching performance is not merely the sum of distinct competencies • geared to rid a system of incompetent teachers not to improve performance or recognize excellence • expensive to implement • not all teaching can be reduced to a competency framework • teaching and learning is dependent on contextual factors which limit the usefulness of generic competencies • generic competencies are not supported by research • has been used mostly with beginning not experienced teachers

References: Elletl & Capie (1980); Lewis (1982); Peterson & Kauchak (1982)